DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 139 798 95 SP 011 109

AUTHOR Kaplan, George R.
TITLE From Aide to Teacher: The Story of the Career Opportunities Program.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO HEW-OE-76-12010
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 149p.
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Vocational Education; *Career Ladders; Career Opportunities; *College School Cooperation; *Federal Programs; Internship Programs; *Low Income Groups; On the Job Training; *Paraprofessional School Personnel; School Community Relationship; Teacher Aides; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Career Opportunities Program

ABSTRACT

This booklet relates the history of the Career Opportunities Program (COP). The objective of the COP was to provide for indigenous community residents working as paraprofessional teacher aides in the nation's low-income urban and rural schools the opportunity to advance within the education profession and, ultimately, to improve the learning of the children in those schools. The program received Federal support. An important factor in the development of this program was the character of the individual trainee. Belonging to the same ethnic and minority groups as the children with whom they dealt, they brought to the position of teacher aide rapport and sympathetic understanding of the pupils. There gradually developed a cooperative working relationship between schools in the COP program and local institutions of higher learning. Colleges and universities became involved, adjusting credit requirements, recognizing the value of experience, and eventually accepting COP interns as students. This involvement led to the hoped-for end product--a teacher aide could take courses in cooperating colleges and finally receive teacher certification. This enabled many low-income and minority group people to advance in the teaching profession from the modest beginning of helping in the classroom to fully accredited teachers, often achieving degrees beyond the basic B.A. (JD)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED139798

HEW Publication No. (OE) 76–12010

From Aide To Teacher

THE STORY
OF THE
CAREER OPPORTUNITIES
PROGRAM

George R. Kaplan
New Careers Training Laboratory
New York, N. Y.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP 011 105

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*
Office of Education
Ernest L. Boyer, *Commissioner*

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1977

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402—Price $3
Stock No. 017-080-01566-8

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

Dedication

The transcendent force and the dominant fact about the Career Opportunities Program was the paraprofessional participant. To write about COP is to rediscover what sacrifice and dedication are all about. Both are epitomized by the more than 14,000 persons who underwent the COP process, and it is to them that this document is dedicated.

Foreword

The Career Opportunities Program (COP) was probably the most soundly innovative of the two dozen or more educational personnel development programs supported under the provisions of the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA). The program succeeded in testing the theoretical notions (1) that closer ethnic, cultural, and socioeconomic identification between teacher and learner could enhance the teaching/learning milieu, (2) that the quality of the "affective domain" relationships between teacher and child does in fact bear significantly on the child's developmental potential, and (3) that there is a rich lode of competence and commitment among the disadvantaged populations of our Nation that can be tapped in the public interest if provided with the necessary public support.

The outcome—in quantifiable data as well as informed and responsible judgments—lent support to these notions, thus raising them to the level of operating principles. COP had served these notions well by bringing new and different kinds of people into the Nation's classrooms as aides and professionals, marshalling future support with each new successful program implementation.

The following pages describe this experience in some detail. George Kaplan, the author and principal researcher, was himself a member of the staff of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development and its successor agency, the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems (NCIES). A fortuitous development subsequently brought him to the New Careers Training Laboratory, which conceived and developed this volume as a product of its consultative relationship with the program.

Out of his direct knowledge and experience as a staff officer at the bureau level, Mr. Kaplan has fashioned an incisive, comprehensive, and professionally useful account of a Federal program that worked. Less a history than a humanly intriguing story, his account retains its value for the policymaker and the educational professional. Going beyond the indication of certain caveats in education policy development, it also suggests promising new directions for public policy in the matter of manpower training for social service occupations. The training and successful participation of Vietnam-era veterans in COP, for example, may well warrant policy consideration as a general manpower training model for low-income veterans who have been hardest hit by unemployment.

In sum, this volume commends itself as a well-written account of a Federal program conceived, tested, and successfully managed to meet a clearly identified social need.

W. Thomas Carter
Director, Division of
Educational Systems Development
U.S. Office of Education

Acknowledgments

This effort to capture the essence of the many-sided and remarkable Career Opportunities Program of the United States Office of Education owes much to many. The designers and early administrators of the program—persons like Wilton Anderson, William Smith, Russell Wood, and Don Davies—were a remarkable collection of skilled, visionary, and yet compassionate educational leaders. And they were important contributors of the often elusive information that forms the backbone of this narrative. No less helpful were the men and women of USOE, both in Washington and in the USOE regions, who responded quickly and unstintingly whenever their data or expertise were needed.

At various times and for periods that could only have constituted an inordinate burden on them, the people of COP throughout the country—in site visits, interviews, conferences, telephone conferences, reports, and by almost every means conceivable—gave unhesitatingly of their time, knowledge, and, above all, their analytical, often critical insights about COP. The list of directors, coordinators, teachers, and participants who contributed to the process is endless. As the patient principal targets of a ceaseless stream of requests for time and information, the directors merit more than just special mention.

This document is a product of the New Careers Training Laboratory of Queens College. That is its legal and official status. But NCTL was more than just its administrative home. Throughout the labor that went into this accounting of the COP experience, Alan Gartner of NCTL combined the roles of conscience and mentor. Noteworthy, too, were the editorial contributions of Gina Schachter of NCTL as well as those of Mel Freeland and Ethel Mingo, who provided impressive and uncomplaining technical support.

A special word is due Margaret Coughlin, whose contributions as research associate from August 1974 to July 1975 played an important role in shaping the document. A diligent and capable colleague, Dr. Coughlin generated valuable information, prepared draft site-visit and other supporting reports, and was the author of the first version of chapter 2.

Some of the interpretations and conclusions, as well as the facts, will be open to dispute. The author bears full responsibility, of course, and welcomes the opportunity of defending them.

Contents

Page

Chapter 1. The Forces Converge 1
Chapter 2. The Paraprofessional: A New Actor in Public Education 15
Chapter 3. The Birth of a Program 33
Chapter 4. The Ingredients of a COP Project 44
Chapter 5. The City as COP Turf 68
Chapter 6. In the Country: Large Waves in Small Ponds 86
Chapter 7. The Unlikely Alliance: COP and Academe 103
Chapter 8. An Interim Summing Up 117
Notes on Sources 129
References 135

Chapter 1. The Forces Converge

What's in a Name?

It was a time of catchy acronyms and labels that conveyed both content and image. First came the New Frontier, then the Great Society. Both emblemized America in the 1960s—a decade of zestful human energy harnessed to long-neglected causes. The names resounded well: War on Poverty, VISTA, Head Start, Medicare. Then there were the Teacher, Peace, and Job Corps and a galaxy of equally famous—or infamous—mobilizations, fronts, and authorities. Some measures without descriptive labels stuck in the memory as a consequence of sheer size and ambition. Take title I of Lyndon Johnson's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for example: here was an historic national undertaking to feed huge doses of Federal dollars to needy schools. Catchy label or not, it engraved itself in the consciousness.

In a decade when medium often dominated or sidetracked message, a memorable name and presentation could matter, often too much, for it could substantially influence political or public acceptance of a movement or an agency or a program designed to serve a worthy cause. Timeliness or the impression of it could mean advantageous publicity. And if a cause could garner the status legislation accords, which many did, it was dealing not from weakness but from a position of unquestioned legitimacy. Failing this, endorsement, identification, or even passing reference by a political headliner could keep a worthy effort somewhere near the center of the popular awareness it needed for a prosperous life or simply survival.

The Career Opportunities Program (COP), a scarcely known offshoot of the underpublicized Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) of June 29, 1967, never achieved this kind of status. Inconspicuously begun 3 years after passage of the enabling legislation, which never mentioned or even hinted at it, and with Johnson, the "education president," 18 months into retirement, this Federal education program bore the misleading acronym COP. Those outside its orbit of schools, colleges, and poverty communities—if they had heard of it at all—might have assumed COP was directed toward improving the performance or popular concept of the Nation's police or, once the full name emerged, that it was a design for advancing deserving workers in unskilled, skilled, or semiprofessional fields. It could equally easily have been mistaken for the name of a human-power-oriented, career-incentive program. COP did not become any legislator's passionately-held, very special baby. Nor was there any but fleeting publicity, and what there was originated and had its life within the project locality, not at a national level.

The currents that merged to form COP were unique reflections of the times in which it was conceived. That it came into existence in an atmosphere markedly less receptive than that in which it was designed and that its passage was often troubled do not blur its accomplishments. Quite the contrary. Certainly among COP's singular ironies, though, is that deriving from its germination in the "education president's" administration and its execution in a half-decade of waning commitment by the Nixon administration.

A Demonstration at Mid-Range

Size and money are not everything, but they surely help. No one ever mistook the Career Opportunities Program for one of the Federal government's major initiatives. To set it in reasonable perspective, it ranked somewhere near the middle of the "discretionary" (nonformula, nonearmarked) program efforts of the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) but higher when only teacher education programs are considered. Its annual budget never exceeded $27.8 million—the actual total is $129,390,000 over a period spanning 7 fiscal years; it numbered fewer than 15,000 participants; fewer than 3,000 of the Nation's 88,864 public schools were involved at 132 locations; and 272 of the country's 2,665 institutions of higher education (1,701 4-year and 964 community or junior colleges) had a role in the endeavor. On a quantitative scale ranging from the fundings for small, short-term, limited purpose, Federal education outlays to the multibillion-dollar Elementary and Secondary School Act, COP is perhaps best characterized as a *mid-range demonstration.* Such a demonstration, in the words of Dr. William L. Smith, an early national COP administrator, "brings together a series of program ideas found successful in earlier, more limited efforts, and seeks to demonstrate the potential in their combination and expansion."

At its core, the Career Opportunities Program was an uncomplicated attempt to provide for indigenous community residents working as paraprofessional teacher aides in the Nation's low-income urban and rural schools the opportunity to advance within the education professions and, ultimately, to improve the learning of the children in those schools. It is tempting to read much more into this undertaking, and the record is indeed dotted with examples of benefits derived from COP that had not been anticipated as programwide outcomes. Some universities changed their teacher training modes. A number of low-income communities reawakened to their schools. Individual lives acquired new importance in varied, unforeseen ways. But this record, frustratingly immune to quantification, is only a part of the COP story. The rest, the main part, is found in the hardcore educational principles and social imperatives that led to its creation—the threads from which the COP fabric was woven. In the final analysis, COP centered for the most part on the paraprofessionals who risked taking its route.

The origins of COP encompass many themes and strains, all connected to the malaises of American society in the 1960s and the educational systems that served it. But a variety of impressions concerning COP's doctrinal tenets persisted throughout its life. There was no lack of cause-advocates at or near the center of COP who could convincingly demonstrate the validity of their cases, even when their relationship to COP's explicit goals was secondary or tenuous. One such case was the notion that COP was really meant to stand traditional teacher education on its head in every postsecondary institution that boasted a COP arrangement. A second held that the real motive of COP was to help those who were traditionally excluded to gain and consolidate political power in the deteriorated communities. A third saw COP as the leading agent of a national effort to break every known lockstep in public education and to gain control of schools in low-income ghettos, barrios, reservations, and blighted rural communities. To still others, COP was the leading edge of a technological revolution in the schools, the "vehicle and catalyst for bringing about improvements in school organization and curriculum," the broker-expeditor of town-gown linkages, or, in short, a broad gauge force for the attainment of certain specific educational and political ends—a kind of educational conglomerate in which many worthy goals, though not too closely linked, could be achieved.

In diverse places at various times, COP did in fact fill these and other roles, often in unanticipated ways which appeared to make them main themes. But, however great their impact, these were essentially secondary functions of the program. The conditions under which COP was formed, and the needs it was formed to meet, were of a more fundamental and explicit kind, like the following:

- Children in schools in low-income settings, who were still in 1970 the victims of multifarious forms of discrimination, would be well served by the presence of neighborhood people who would function as teacher aides or paraprofessionals in their classrooms. To young, poor, minority students, community people would bring identifiable values and perspectives that would help to bridge the gap between child and education in ways largely unavailable to the "regular" school staffs, who were still mostly middle-class, "majority" suburbanites.

- A widely shared but largely untested judgment already existed that the aides themselves were capable of advancement and vastly improved personal images. To provide the necessary processes and mechanisms, soundly designed career ladders or "lattices," which would accord recognition, dignity, and measurable economic rewards, needed to be adopted.
- The steady growth of the New Careers Movement since the mid-1960s had sensibly postulated that progress in public service careers, including education, should be limited only by the ability of the aspiring careerist, not by economic or social status. The proposition that advancement from lower levels to full professional status should be encouraged and subsidized, and that the "new careerists" should have a voice in decisions affecting themselves and their institutions, was basic.
- The conviction was growing, in USOE and elsewhere in the education community, that the needs of children and of schools, formulated by them rather than the professional trainers of future teachers, should be the decisive factor in determining what kinds of training should take place.
- Unquantifiable but impressive evidence indicated that the realistic prospect of career advancement for low-income paraprofessional workers in the human services areas could exercise a significant positive influence over the lives of families, neighbors, and whole poverty communities.
- A decade of generally heavier citizen involvement in public affairs had brought about increasing popular acceptance of a role for the neighborhood in the affairs of its schools. The nature of this role could be located somewhere on a spectrum between token committee membership and full community control of the schools. In COP's world, at least in the program's early days, there was a notable tilt toward the latter.

The availability, late in the Johnson administration, of the legislative authority to design and carry out a program incorporating these strands was a key element in the COP picture. But even more important was the tough decision, made by USOE, that that authority, Part D of the Education Professions Development Act, should be applied almost exclusively to meeting the educational concerns of the low-income strata in national life, and that its keystone would be COP, the first independently designed program EPDA's managers were to administer.

Of the conditions and needs we have listed, only the first—the theory and practice of paraprofessionalism in American schools—can look back on a history clearly predating *Brown* v. *Topeka Board of Education*, the landmark 1954 Supreme Court decision that can be credited with providing impetus for the others. American public education has long had a tradition, however spotty and unfocused, of older children helping younger ones. Of parents and unskilled workers relieving overextended teachers of time-devouring, menial chores, and even of educated aides assuming instructional tasks in classrooms. That the aides or assistants represented a vocational core with the potential for lateral and upward career mobility, however, cannot be readily documented prior to the Bay City experiment in the use of classroom teacher aides in 1953 (see chapter 2). It was not until several years later that the combination of these solutions and opportunities for the benefit of the Nation's impoverished schools was considered a suitable subject for Federal support. In the meantime, however, the Federal role in education had gradually been expanding to meet diverse national needs, and it was this chain of events that eventually gave rise to COP.

The Expanding Federal Role: National Security & Domestic Imperatives

The circuitous trail to COP's authorization began at a point in 1957 when Soviet science, with its Sputnik space shot, unconsciously precipitated a merger of our national security and domestic educational imperatives. In the face of this painfully public Soviet competitive triumph, it became easier for an aroused Republican White House and a Democratic Congress to rally the "good guys" quickly and reasonably effectively. The immediate product was the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958.

The principal initial concern of NDEA was the allegedly lamentable state of education in science, technology, and foreign languages; and a variety of devices were designed to close the perceived gaps that many felt were intensifying a cold war. Though the content of NDEA's fellowships, institutes, and conferences was thus concentrated heavily on languages and the implications of the adversary's emerging technologies, it nonetheless foreshadowed something new in American public life: the extensive involvement of the Federal Government in planning and administering large training programs for educators. Historically held to be the province of the States, localities, and private and religious bodies, education had been a Federal concern only to the extent that certain statistical, pump-priming, demonstration-type, or immediate need-meeting activities had to emanate from national rather than regional or special sources. The great education legislation preceding NDEA—Morrill, Smith-Hughes, the GI Bill, the Vocational Education Act—had authorized and funded huge enterprises; they had not, however, represented direct, large-scale Federal intervention and control, particularly where teachers and poor people were concerned.

By mid-1963, after 5 years of NDEA, USOE still had no legal authority to support the training and retraining of elementary and secondary school teachers, whether for Evanston, Harlem, or East Los Angeles. In fact, out of the panoply of efforts undertaken with hundreds of millions of NDEA dollars, only two programs even came close: Title V-B, which initiated a series of summer institutes for training teachers of modern foreign languages, and, beginning in December 1963, a program authorized in an amendment to NDEA which permitted the training of teachers of English as a second language. The latter may, in fact, have constituted the very first Federal program designed to meet the needs of "disadvantaged," "culturally deprived," or "underprivileged" groups.

Within a year, progress of sorts had been achieved. In extending NDEA for 3 years in Oct. 1964—the threat of Soviet science was still in evidence, but was apparently not as menacing as in 1958—Congress authorized USOE to dispense $30 million for summer training institutes in nine content areas, including "teachers of disadvantaged youth." Although this heading did not loose a torrent of programs or dollars, it served to reinforce the concept of a Federal role both in teacher training generally and in the training of teachers of the "disadvantaged" in particular.

Despite the efforts noted above, there would not have been a Career Opportunities Program if Lyndon Johnson, who may never have heard of it, had not devoted himself to what Theodore H. White has called the "education president's three Cs"—classroom, city, and countryside. To quote one of White's sources, Johnson had a "passion for education of the same order of intensity as Kennedy's passion for stopping atomic testing." Out of this passion—stemming from his own hard-won education and finely honed political instincts—came a 5-year period of far-reaching Federal intervention in public school education unprecedented in American constitutional history. The Johnson approach was to go straight into the Nation's neglected schools and do something about improving them. The principal vehicle was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965.

ESEA Title I: Linking Teacher Aides and Poverty-Area Schools

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act covered almost as wide a span of public education concerns as could be absorbed by legislator and consumer alike in 1965, and its vast title I authorized $75 million for teacher aides in low-income areas. Nowhere, however, did that legislation state that aides were necessarily to be recruited from poor neighborhoods. Nor did it provide for such features as career-oriented inservice training or career lattices. Nor did title I prescribe or even suggest processes that would transform aides into full-fledged schoolteachers with bachelor's degrees, licenses, and coffee mugs in the teachers' lounge. The aides were, to be sure, important new human elements in ghetto, barrio, reservation, and poor rural school systems, but they were not part of the establishment, such as it was, in any professional sense. In the mid-sixties, in particular, they were recognized almost solely as examples or agents of an even larger, almost external cause: the War on Poverty.

With title I on the books and receiving massive political support, Federal sponsorship of teacher aides in low-income schools nevertheless became a fact, and its salient feature was the link between poverty-area schools and nonprofessional classroom assistants. To quote a vulgarism of the day, the "Feds" put their money where their mouths were. If there was no legislated direction of the title I teacher aide effort, there was at least the hope that it would somehow flow into the larger designs for school improvement that progressive school superintendents, boards, and community groups were framing. More frequently than supporters of the teacher aide idea would have wished, the movement was to become a byproduct of larger efforts, or a low-priority issue in title I school systems. While some aides occupied some of the more challenging jobs in low-income communities, others were consigned to unskilled, dead end posts which offered precious few rewards, material or psychological.

Yet, like Head Start a short time before it, title I filled a highly visible, often constructive role in accustoming low-income communities to the virtues of classroom paraprofessionals and Federal policymakers to their manifold implications for public policy. Within 3 years of the enactment of ESEA, the title I program boasted 64,000 salaried aides and an additional 180,000 volunteers closely linking classroom to poverty community and intruding on territory long occupied by the professional establishment. Out of this large but shapeless experience developed some of the attitudes and conditions that eased COP's passage into the schools. Where title I aides had been or frequently still were serving, COP's paraprofessionals could count on a high measure of advance acceptance. They could usually reckon, too, on a community which had newly rediscovered its schools and was collaborating in the effort to improve them. And in the classroom, COP aides often found teachers who needed, knew how to use, and did not feel threatened by the COP trainees. There was plenty of work for everyone.

The Scheuer Amendment: Training the Poor for New Careers

In 1966, the Scheuer Amendment to the War on Poverty's basic legislation, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, authorized $33 million for the development of demonstration programs for the economically needy. Despite their poverty, participants were expected to have had sufficient background and motivation to take aide-level positions in human service fields which would lead them into promising, socially beneficial, new careers. Although much of the Scheuer funds eventually supported specifically educational programs at many of their 30-odd sites (of which Minneapolis, later also a prominent COP site, has been one of the most closely examined) housing, social work, community development, child welfare, law enforcement, and health and welfare programs have also benefited. It constituted the first serious manifestation of Federal program concern with and support for nonprofessional aides outside the world of education. Of greater immediate import for COP, however, was the Scheuer Amendment's emphasis on developing new careers for the trainees.

EPDA: Quality Teacher Training as Federal Policy

With the passage of NDEA, the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965 (which provided for training of both experienced and prospective teachers of all kinds) and the Scheuer Amendment, all empowered to support the improvement of teaching in American schools, the Federal Government had at last declared its concern over the state of the teaching scene in public education. But nowhere in the array of legislation on education was there a specific act pointed straight at what informed citizens were coming to recognize as a most pressing priority: doing something about the *quality* of the people who staff the country's schools. It was to serve that priority, among others to be discussed later, that the Education Professions Development Act was written.

The path of EPDA through the sectors and levels of the congressional process was heavily influenced by developments its authors could hardly have predicted. Like the riders on civil rights or highway safety bills that may ultimately decide the fate of legislation on strip mining, the seemingly extraneous case of Teacher Corps came to dominate EPDA's path through the legislative process. For at the time it was the fate of Teacher Corps, rather than the future of the much larger EPDA, that was of permanent concern to educational policy makers in Washington. Scheduled to expire on June 30, 1967, the authority for that controversial 2-year-old program was to become part of the new EPDA. But its inclusion rightly triggered discussion, led to delay, and ultimately overshadowed the debate on EPDA. With committee and floor debate primarily focused on Teacher Corps, the EPDA legislation, drafted by a team headed by HEW Deputy Assistant Secretary Samuel Halperin, sailed virtually unscathed through both bodies of Congress. Alterations were not substantive, and President Johnson signed Public Law 90-35 on June 29, 1967, less than 2 days before Teacher Corps was to have died. To quote then Senator Peter H. Dominick, "the legislative process is being bypassed" by a Senate "forced to ransom the Teacher Corps." The remark cannot be seriously challenged.

That legislative authority for training educational staff was needed is beyond question. What is arguable, though, is whether the EPDA authority should have been applied as it eventually was, in some 15 sharply fragmented, only rarely synchronized programs aimed at everyone in the business from teachers in one-room rural schoolhouses to school superintendents working on Harvard doctorates to unemployed urban ghetto dwellers. Clearly, EPDA was many things to many people.

Writing in the June 1974 issue of *Theory Into Practice*, Don Davies, the first Associate Commissioner for Educational Personnel Development, USOE, commented:

> Some saw the new program as primarily an aid to meeting the teacher shortage. Others emphasized the objective of encouraging institutional change in colleges and schools. Some looked to the legislation as a means of expanding and strengthening existing programs such as the prospective teacher fellowships or the institutes for teachers. Some expected that the bill would concentrate on problems of poverty-area schools, others hoped that it would be all encompassing. Many emphasized training opportunities for individuals; others emphasized institutional change. Some called for aggressive Office of Education leadership in setting priorities, writing tough guidelines, monitoring and rigorous evaluation; others hoped that the agency would be primarily responsive to the ideas and needs of the field. Some saw the significant participation by State education agencies set out in some parts of the act as its most important feature; others feared such participation and wanted it strictly limited. A few stressed boldness and innovation, but most called for slower improvement of more conventional programs. Liberal arts professors and organizations anticipated that the bill would permit greater stress to be placed on preparation in academic disciplines. Faculty and administrators in schools and departments of education saw their first opportunity for major Federal assistance for teacher education. Nearly every specialized group in education—school administrators, counselors, school librarians, school nurses, reading specialists, business officers, teachers in every field—wanted a major part of the action.

To an OE task force created by Commissioner Harold Howe II in late 1966, almost a year before EPDA's passage, the need for such legislation was dictated primarily by the shortage of teachers. This was considered, almost of and by itself, to be sufficient rationale for the major new initiative that EPDA came to represent. There was little doubt in most informed Washington minds that classrooms were woefully understaffed. But consensus was lacking in 1966 and 1967 on the size and special characteristics appropriate to the teaching force of the future. To Howe's Task Force on Educational Manpower, an interagency group staffed by some of Washington's more enlightened functionaries, this condition could lead in only one direction—the creation of a mechanism to assess needs for educational staff. The chosen means was the legislative requirement, based on the experience of the Manpower Development Act of 1962, and stated as the *first* purpose of EPDA, that information be developed "on the actual needs for educational personnel, both present and long range." Obsessively concerned that this obligation would be met haphazardly or indifferently by the executive branch, the framers of the EPDA legislation stated exactly what kinds of information were to be provided. They called for annual reports and instructed the Commissioner of Education to describe the "plans concerning the allocation of Federal assistance under this title in relation to the plans and programs of other Federal agencies." Earnest efforts were made by USOE to meet these tough mandates. But good information was often just not available, and no amount of sophisticated analysis could hide that fact.

No less important than valid data, both to Federal functionaries and a growing constituency of grant-receiving institutions and jurisdictions, was a compelling need to bring order out of the "scattered, excessively categorical and inflexible" teacher training programs then existing within the Federal establishment. Once this was accomplished, the task force reasoned, some progress could be registered in bringing about long needed change in the way school staffs, notably teachers, are trained. Indeed, before EPDA was 2 years old, its administrators were talking of change, personal and institutional, as its fundamental purpose, with or without program consolidation. In February 1969, Associate Commissioner Davies wrote in USOE's *American Education:*

> If we want to bring about change in education, if we want to alter the direction in which we are moving, we first have to bring about change in people—in the attitudes, qualifications, and competencies of all the people who make our schools and colleges run. That is what the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) is all about.

For the Congress, however, change *per se* was not the objective. Many, in fact, would surely not have voted for EPDA had they detected that the notion of change was of paramount importance for its Federal administrators. Not until far into EPDA's life was it generally understood that, to some of EPDA's managers, it meant effecting fundamental changes in the ways teachers were to be trained.

Congress did not instruct the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to invent and nurture COP. And nowhere in EPDA is the program mentioned by name. Something like encouragement for a COP-type undertaking can be discerned, though, in part D, Section 531(b) (3) and (5), which says, in effect, that grants *may* be made to appropriate recipients (college, State, or local school agencies) for "programs or projects to train teacher aides and other nonprofessional educational personnel." Not a word about such commonly accepted objectives as: (1) anticipated effects on children, (2) expected institutional reforms, (3) making fully accredited teachers out of the participants, (4) changing the ways in which teachers are taught, (5) involving whole communities, or (6) professionalizing the educational paraprofessional. While part D of EPDA failed to underwrite the specifics, what it did manage, at least as interpreted by those who conceived and administered its programs, was a legislative invitation to center EPDA programs where there was need and to design better ways of training teachers.

At the core of the COP idea was the expectation that its ambitious, career-minded participants were on their way to professional status as teachers. But, between the passage of EPDA in 1967 and 3 years later when the first COP trainee entered the classroom, increasing attention was being paid to a shift in the national balance between supply and demand for teachers. A few words, then, on COP's relationship to the developing surplus.

Teacher Shortage/Teacher Surplus

In an informal postmortem on his early days (1968-69) as EPDA administrator, Don Davies remarked, "We were perhaps remiss in downplaying reports of a developing surplus of teachers." Estimates of an impending surplus had been spotlighted within Davies' Bureau of Educational Personnel Development as early as 1967 in a report by Joseph Froomkin, then USOE's Associate Commissioner for Planning and Evaluation. But even after Froomkin had warned of an emerging glut of teachers, *The Education Professions: 1968*, EPDA's 1969 report, was still indicating that massive numerical and specialized needs existed. Citing information from the NEA, it reported, "There was a teacher shortage in 1967-68. Were we to try to meet standards of 'minimum quality' as defined by the National Education Association, we would have needed nearly 400,000 additional teachers in 1967-68."

Both sources were probably right, and Davies' decision to go ahead with COP was not as questionable as the Froomkin contention might have suggested. Judged by conventional economic and demographic criteria, large surpluses loomed; but shortages in critical geographic and specialized sectors would continue to plague public education, and Froomkin's principal implication, that the Federal education establishment should no longer fund preservice teacher training programs, had only limited validity. It nonetheless made launching COP, continuing the 4-year-old Teacher Corps, and otherwise involving USOE in preservice training vulnerable to bureaucratic and congressional criticism. No amount of rationalization premised on social or professional grounds could fully dispel the doubts underlying this criticism. The baptism of an endeavor of COP's scope in an atmosphere of doubt is hardly an ideal beginning. And when USOE, the Department of Labor, and the NEA itself joined the "surplus chorus" in the early 1970s, BEPD's seeming perverse insistence on training teachers became increasingly difficult to defend as a matter of public policy and good economic sense. In fact, it was both, for BEPD's programs were actually helping to relieve still-existing shortages (inner city, handicapped, early childhood, bilingual) or providing support for the improvement of the performance of teachers already in the schools.

By the mid-1970s, the NEA, the RAND Corporation, and the Study

Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers at the University of Nebraska, among others, had begun to speculate whether the profession had overreacted, even in terms of the admittedly impressive statistical evidence; and whether attractive alternative career paths for trained teachers might not have beneficial spinoff for public educational systems. They began to wonder aloud whether the surplus couldn't be managed in a way that capitalized on and responded to real needs. For it had begun to appear to them that the magnitude of the overall surplus was inhibiting the preparation of special teachers for special jobs.

For COP, the peak surfeit of teachers which was expected to begin in 1974 and 1975, when the bulk of COP's aides were scheduled to enter the profession, was no cause for panic. Unlike "regular" education majors throughout the country whose graduation in 1974 and 1975 found them with markedly limited employment prospects in their chosen fields, relatively few of COP's new professionals faced uncertain professional futures. They were known quantities, and school officials were strongly disposed to place them at the top of their hiring lists, even in systems with many more applicants than vacancies. A cross section of their comments: "We'll take the COP person almost every time. . . . " "She's mature, a seasoned teacher, and usually excellent with kids who, like herself, haven't been dealt very good hands. . . . " "She's already in the system, and we know what she can do. . . . " "We know that we may be overlooking someone extra special by not taking a gifted, young, education-school graduate with great potential, but that's the risk we're willing to run. The COP people have first call on vacancies in our districts."

Although they cannot hope to achieve a quantifiable statistical status, comments of this character pepper the national COP map. They indicate COP's graduates have brought an extraordinary dimension to teaching—empathy with minority children—to supplement the routine qualifications deriving from their standard 4-year teacher education curriculum and their situations as paraprofessionals. The origins of that unique dimension provide its distinctiveness, for only a tiny fraction of the COP trainees were 21-year-old, suburban, white, education majors. Like the children they served, they were street-strengthened. They were predominantly low-income Black, but also Chicano, Puerto Rican, American Indian, and poor white. Before they entered COP, many were less than hopeful about the social roles to which they had been consigned.

The School System as Consumer of Teacher Training

The COP design for teacher training represented a sharp, almost definitive break from established procedures and values. No longer, at least in COP's world, would the teacher training institution and the State department of education (depending on statutes, locales, and relationships) effectively determine the training needs of the staffs of public schools. Indeed, it was the express intention of COP's architects that the colleges and universities not call the tune as they had been doing for federally backed teacher training efforts since the summer institutes of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. For the first time on anything like a national scale, school systems and the populations of their districts were to determine what kinds of people they needed for their schools. To an extraordinary degree, they were also to stipulate how that training would take place. The function of the teacher education institutions would be to deliver the trained product. The COP grant would thus go to schools, who would then sub-contract to the higher education establishment for services as specified by the school and its community. If an institution felt it could deliver, details were arranged; if not, others were usually available and interested. The record of tenders accepted and declined tells much about the readiness of teacher training institutions to break with the comfortable past.

The shift from the college to the school as prime teacher training agent was surely one of COP's most characteristic features. The decision to select this new road stemmed from a collective judgment deeply rooted in the backgrounds and convictions of the program's planners, both inside and outside the U.S. Office of Education. It is based, too, on a growing body of opinion and evidence suggesting that:

- the consumer, whether of automobiles or educational services, deserves a voice in deciding what kinds of products to buy;
- there are many potential providers of teacher training services, but only those capable of producing the product desired by the communities in which teachers teach should be patronized;
- teacher training institutions were only on the fringes of the revolutionary currents flowing through American higher education and, by making only superficial shifts in the way they prepared educators, had forfeited their right to a monopoly on training teachers; and
- arrangements changing the locus of decisive influence in teacher training could have far-reaching positive effects on how children are taught, relationships among institutions and the people affected by them, and, by extension, how communities mobilize resources to solve basic problems.

The COP participants—older, less advantaged, and far different from the typical teachers' college undergraduate—were ideally suited for the experiment.

* * *

The COP story amounts to an assessment of the developments and concepts introduced above. Some, like the teacher shortage of the 1960s, lost momentum and even changed direction during the COP process; others, notably the college in its new role, displayed unforeseen strength. The consistent strength of the so-called "non-negotiable" conceptual elements has been noteworthy in the following areas, among others: a focus on teacher aides/paraprofessionals; the primacy of the school as the projects' main agent; the parity-level role of the neighborhoods and communities. Another given was COP's ethnic variety and the socio-economic implications it created. For COP was lineally descended from the Black civil rights and economic struggles of the generation that preceded it, and it was synchronized with the Hispanic-American and American Indian quests for equality that paralleled its 5 full years. By any measure, COP was a program of, by, and for minority Americans, strongly Black in participants (54 percent), project locales, composition of school population, and attitudinally. But it also penetrated deeply into the Hispanic (10.7 percent Chicano, 3.6 percent Puerto Rican), Native American (3.7 percent), and poor white (24.7 percent) communities of America. The burden was thus placed at both ends of the COP spectrum—Washington and the individual sites—to demonstrate that minority Americans could seriously address problems that the majority society had failed to solve.

---

*Although technically part of BEPD from 1968 to 1972, Teacher Corps, a program which trained 1,500-2,000 mostly white, graduate interns each year (it has changed drastically in recent years), led its own life, complete with congressional liaison and public relations staffs, national media coverage, and a well-developed public image as a kind of domestic Peace Corps in education.

Chapter 2. The Paraprofessional: A New Actor in Public Education

Without paraprofessionals drawn from the neediest neighborhoods in the country and working in their schools, there would have been no Career Opportunities Program. It is what the COP paraprofessional has done to and for public education that gives the program its special significance.

The antecedents of the educational paraprofessional are close to the historical mainstream of American public education. Rooted in the traditions of the Anglo Saxon institutions of the society, these antecedents had little or nothing to do with Black or Hispanic-surnamed or Native Americans. The most noted, early, large-scale experiment in the utilization of teacher aides, which occurred in the 1950s in Bay City, Mich., included only the college-educated middle class and had almost no lineal connection to the kinds of people and circumstances that made up the COP profile. Yet only 20 years later, Arthur Pearl, writing of the new "indigenous" paraprofessional, promoted an educational doctrine based on such principles as these:

1. The paraprofessional is a prime necessity to reestablishing the creditability of the public school.
2. The paraprofessional is a prime necessity to reestablishing the creditability of the school of education.
3. The paraprofessional is vital to the development of consumer power in education.
4. The paraprofessional is vital to the establishment of fiscal priorities and the adequate funding of current as well as future education responsibilities. (Pearl, 1975.)

The Pearl dicta transcend social classes and educational distinctions. They may assign too weighty a role to paraprofessionals in achieving educational improvement. But they do provide a setting for an elaboration of the teacher aide as a "new actor," and they set tough, if not impossible, criteria against which to interpret the COP place in the para-professional firmament.

* * *

Bay City and Beyond

The first known use of classroom assistants in America occurred with the adoption of the British "monitorial" system in the early 19th century by several of the religiously motivated, straightlaced "public school societies," mainly in New England, which were trying to provide free education to the poor. To relieve the teachers' burdens in these one-room, rural schools, older students drilled rows of younger pupils in reading or numbers. The system evidently worked adequately, and the boys themselves learned by teaching, a concept which is used widely today in the Youth Tutoring Youth (YTY) program, which, in some schools, is directed by COP participants. A century later, the male students had stepped aside, and the teaching profession had become predominantly female. (Not so in school administration, in which there are five men for every woman.)

With the establishment of State normal schools in the second half of the 19th century—and the creation of an assured flow of teachers—untrained student aides were no longer indispensable. In the 1930s, a New Deal program for the training and utilization of unskilled, low-income workers in public service was initiated by the National Youth Administration (NYA). This program to train unemployed, out-of-school youth for jobs as nonprofessionals in the human services was the first federally funded attempt to mobilize the unskilled for such work. But COP was not cut from NYA's cloth; the NYA workers were younger, overwhelmingly white, and were in the program to stay off the breadlines of the times rather than to build careers in the human services or blaze new trails in paraprofessionalism. Ironically, their program was terminated in 1943 during a wartime teacher shortage which was to extend for many years into the postwar period as a general classroom personnel shortage. Presumably linking necessity and invention, intrepid administrators in some schools took to employing high school graduates as "helpers" to assist hard-pressed teachers with their swollen classroom populations. Basically a stopgap, wartime measure of short duration, the practice nonetheless attracted favorable notice. One reviewer of this teacher-helper plan noted that "the teacher-helper soon becomes a very valuable assistant to the regular home room teacher," and concluded that "one teacher can do a thorough job with as many as forty pupils if she has the assistance of a teacher-helper for one-half day" (Greenberg, 1967).

The threat of a post-World War II shortage of classroom teachers, which materialized patchily and belatedly, contributed to a major breakthrough in the teacher aide movement. In 1953, the Ford Foundation, then moving into public education on a large scale, inaugurated the first major systemwide experiment using auxiliary personnel in the schools. Its goal, simply stated, was to try one way of saving the time of overworked teachers without large outlays of money. Set in middle-class Bay City, Mich., the program was the product of concern over a potentially acute shortage in the workforce expected to result from the baby boom of the postwar era. One survey estimated that the shortage of qualified teachers would be 312,000 for the Nation in 1953. And the situation was further aggravated by the overworked state of the profession.

The Bay City model remained a strong influence on the character of the teacher aide movement until the middle sixties. Nonetheless, three factors made this radical educational experiment a dead end for paraprofessionals:

1. The emphasis was on improving the instructional process *indirectly* by making it easier for the teacher to teach, and *not* on using the talents of the aide to assist in and improve the instructional process.
2. There was no opportunity for career advancement. School staffing patterns followed quite rigid designs similar to those in the medical field, where paramedical personnal are permitted some mobility within roles but none between them. In the schoolroom as in the hospital, there were strict limitations on what the aide was to be allowed to do. Becoming a full-fledged teacher in his or her own right was not part of the mosaic.
3. As in Bay City, most of the paraprofessionals of the 1950s and well into the 1960s were middle-class, college-educated women content to remain peripheral to the educational mainstream. Even where ambition was evident, advancement within the paraprofessional ranks was sharply limited.

A 1962 study of staff utilization in secondary schools in New York State showed that aides were primarily teachers in training, with college students, college-trained adults, and other adults trailing far behind as categories. Despite their impressive backgrounds, aides worked mostly as lay readers, clerks, test graders, library assistants, and study-hall supervisors (Singer, 1962). As late as 1967, an NEA survey reported that most teachers still believed that teacher aides should be limited to non-instructional, clerical-type chores. Small wonder that EPDA's passages concerning aides posed no threat to the profession.

The outlook for teachers aides, nonetheless, was not all that grim, for developments were occurring outside of education that would lead to radical redefinitions of the role of the educational paraprofessional.

In the Human Services Universe

The Nation's domestic problems provided the need and the Federal Government the impetus for the rediscovery of the new paraprofessional in all human service fields. Unlike his/her middle-class predecessor, the paraprofessional of the 1960s was poor, usually Black or Spanish-surnamed, and often expected to work toward professional status. This latter feature, indeed, was one of his or her distinguishing qualities. The ethos of the marketplace had set in throughout the society, and paraprofessionals no longer valued their increasingly secure niche in the work force. Advancement into the professions was no longer "the impossible dream."

Until 1963 when major programs were financed under the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime, there was no national policy of recruiting human services workers from among the population to be served. The trailblazer was Mobilization for Youth (MFY), which used indigenous persons in school and community work (Gartner, 1971). Its success stimulated the first public call for "the new nonprofessional." This was issued in a 1965 book by Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman titled *New Careers for the Poor: The Nonprofessional in Human Service*.

The main contention of *New Careers for the Poor* is that the poor need access to the professions not only for their own economic improvement and security but also to bend the professions to the needs of the poor. Middle-class teachers, they pointed out, are inadequate to educate the poor; what is needed are paraprofessionals from the children's own community who can relate to these youngsters and, at the same time, advance in the system. The poor themselves would thereby become involved in social change. Later, as the New Careers doctrine evolved, it was to address the issues of governance of the enterprises in which new careerists functioned. Here, predictably, the authors were to call for a strong voice for paraprofessional leadership in the professions to which they belonged.

The human services—generally speaking, education, health, mental health, social work, and the area of police work, corrections, and law enforcement—represent a massive slice of American life in which the poor are major consumers and service is chronically poor. They also offer the poor, through direct involvement as paraprofessionals, their best shot at improving their own services and benefiting most as consumers. As Pearl and Reissman demonstrated, the need was not to serve the poor in order to overcome poverty, but to give the poor an opportunity to serve themselves. More recently, Pearl has contended that increasing the development of this public service sector of our economy at the expense of the private sector has vast implications throughout our national life. By extension, it could actually conserve energy, reduce inflation, prevent concentration of wealth, and offer unlimited employment opportunities to those most badly in need (Pearl, 1974).

The human services have all traditionally employed paraprofessionals in varying numbers and capacities; but, as in education in the era prior to the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Act, these have usually come from the middle class, far removed from the community they were serving. Encouraged by Federal support, this situation is now changing. In the mental health field, it was found that the contribution of lay counselors was enhanced if they came from the community served; by 1969, a survey of 80 community health centers reported that 42 percent of all full-time positions were filled by indigenous workers. Furthermore, according to at least one study, the level of formal training was found to be unrelated to work performance, suggesting that traditional professional education was inadequate. One result has been the introduction of work-specific training in mental health, with an emphasis on practical experience similar to that employed in COP (Gartner, 1971).

The field of social work is dominated by persons, most of whom were middle class and college educated until public attention focused on the special contributions the community-based paraprofessional was beginning to make. Programs such as Mobilization for Youth (MFY) and Project Enable (a 59-community effort) demonstrated that low-income people, without prior training or experience, could simultaneously serve the community and receive on-the-job training. The social welfare client could become the helper (Birnbaum, 1967).

Employment in the health field is profoundly characterized by the unbridgeable gap between the physician at the top and the large population of support personnel below. The health field's occupational hierarchy stands as an unsullied caste system, with sharply limited movement permitted within a caste (i.e., from a nurse's aide to licensed practical nurse to registered nurse, but never from nurse or technician to doctor). Yet even within this rigid structure, there are fields where, it has been found, the indigenous paraprofessional can make significant professional contributions. These areas are growing, especially in community health programs where the family health worker often combines the role of nurse, counselor, social worker, and educator. In some OEO-sponsored projects, the new, locally recruited worker has proved remarkably successful due to her or his entry specialization in health, status as a member of the community, and standing as the patient's advocate.

Paraprofessionals from the neighborhood have been used widely in the fields of law enforcement and corrections. A most impressive contribution was a New Careers program at California Men's Prison where prisoners were trained as trainers of their peers and many went on to distinguished outside careers in the counseling and New Careers fields. One survey of corrections programs concluded that the impact of the nonprofessional on the inmate is greater than that of the professional (Gartner, 1971).

These experiences in the public service fields, all of them closely allied to education, brought to life some long-dormant conclusions about paraprofessionals in the 1960s. For the aides themselves, the experience has resulted in significantly improved self-images as well as increased commitment to a hitherto unattained level of accountability to the client community.

Charles Grosser, et al., in *Nonprofessionals in the Human Services*, published jointly by the National Association of Social Workers and the American Psychological Association, underscore the importance of these newcomers to the human service fields and declare: "Our professions can show their resiliency by moving training and resources to 'where the action is,' by participating actively with the nonprofessionals and behaving as though the professional and the nonprofessional have complementary, if not equivalent, competencies."

Meanwhile, the remarkable record of paraprofessionals in educational programs for career advancement has persuaded more agencies to embrace and combine inservice training with career ladders. One Senate poverty subcommittee, in a survey of public service job development programs, estimated that "a dollar invested in a new worker from the urban ghetto may return anywhere from $4.23 to as much as $12.10 in extra Gross National Product." More concretely, 41 MFY trainees who completed a social health technician program raised their collective income from $20,000 to $160,000 a year and removed 16 persons from the welfare rolls (Vogel, 1970).

In the past, to state a harsh case in Pearl's harsh terms, paraprofessionals have too often been cheap labor, agents of "technical" progress performing menial and clerical tasks to relieve professionals, "cosmetic" agents of token integration, and pacifiers or buffers to protect elites from angry community groups (Pearl, 1974). Experience is showing, however, that today's community-based paraprofessional is unwilling to be co-opted. While approaching the professional in knowledge and expertise, he or she has retained a strong allegiance to the community and may be changing the establishment and the professions in both subtle and direct ways.

The Community-Based Paraprofessional in Education: Enter the "Feds"

A developing combination of legislative support and nongovernmental expertise augured well for the new careers idea. In September 1966, the concept gained congressional legitimacy in the Nelson-Scheuer Amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act (Scheuer's portion was the New Careers program, and Nelson's was a rural training and employment effort). A subsequent separation of the two enabled the New Careers segment to achieve its own identity, and it was turned over for administration to the Department of Labor's Manpower Administration. The basic aims of the amendment included: development of entry-level employment opportunities, assurance of maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment, and inclusion of educational training assistance. Some observers have contended that, still grossly underrecognized and underpaid in the preunion generation, teachers had been leaving the field in staggering numbers. Between 1940 and 1953, some 500,000 had left, many for better paying jobs (Drayer, 1970). Meanwhile, fewer postsecondary students were attracted to teaching at a time when far more profitable work was opening up. By 1953, school classrooms were jammed, and thousands of unqualified teachers were being hired on an emergency basis.

The Bay City experiment was a joint production of the city school system and the College of Education of Central Michigan State College. It was an uncomplicated attempt to free teachers from time-devouring clerical and administrative chores while improving the adult-pupul ratio in the classroom at minimum expense to the school. After ascertaining that up to 60 percent of a typical teacher's time could be and often was spent in nonteaching chores, the projects staff paired teachers and uncredentialed but college trained teacher aides in the city schools to observe the effect of the aides on teacher and pupil performance. Unsurprisingly, the experiment registered positive results; in fact, the presence of aides in Bay City's classrooms was shown to have released the teacher for up to 26 percent more time for instructional activities. On the debit side, an evaluation by Central Michigan State College revealed no appreciable change in the quality of teaching nor in teaching methods. The program was also found to have had little effect on overall costs (A Symposium, 1956).

The Ford Foundation was cautiously modest in its report: "The significance of the Bay City type of project is that aides are used *to improve the quality of education* by freeing teachers to spend their time in actual teaching" (*A Decade*, 1961). The verdict of Bay City School Superintendent Paul Briggs, later to hold the same post in Cleveland, was equivocal. While admitting that "the quality of education has been maintained," he concluded that "the staff of Bay City Public Schools still feel that they would prefer to have smaller classes with regular teachers than to have larger classes with teacher aides" ("Teacher Aide Trial," 1957). The experiment also triggered heavy protest within the teaching profession, which saw itself threatened by the infiltration of "cheap teachers" through the back door. The profession was additionally concerned over the apparent sidestepping of credentialing requirements and the introduction into the classroom of possible critics of the system or of individual teachers. With another college-trained adult in the classroom, class size inevitably grew. Perhaps the most devastating and detailed indictment came from the Michigan State Department of Education in an unpublished report which accused the experimenters of faulty evaluation, flagrant violation of experimental designs, misleading statistics, and, perhaps worst of all, wishful thinking (A Symposium, 1956).

By 1956, the controversy had found its way into the *Journal of Teacher Education*, which provided it a national forum. Those closest to the project—participants, staff, and those educators who visited and observed at some length—liked the plan; those farther removed, including the larger national education establishment, had reservations. Some were actively hostile. Encouraging the teaching profession to welcome all investigation and experimentation, the editors concluded:

> Without question—we believe—the Bay City Experiment will prove its worth. We believe that it may have great value as an emergency plan to help relieve overcrowding, until we can get the needed teachers and classrooms. It will make valuable contributions to teaching. . . . It is important that its sponsors lay on the line real proof of what it can do and what it cannot do. We hope to see more of what it can do and what it cannot do. We hope to see more, not less, experimenting with it by local school districts. (A Symposium, 1956).

Somebody was doing something right in Bay City. Despite the coolness of the Michigan State Department of Education, the teacher aide idea was quickly embraced, always as a humanpower effort rather than as potential educational or social force, by more than 50 Michigan systems. Meanwhile, the Ford Foundation, unconvinced that Bay City had come up short, financed two similar studies, the Yale-Fairfield (Connecticut) study and the Rutgers plan, while New York State adopted the Bay City model, employing 2,389 paraprofessionals statewide in 1953. General acceptance was slow in coming, though, probably because of the educational establishment's overreaction to the Bay City experiment. In a 1960 study, for example, only 19 States reported the use of paraprofessionals, and most of these had only a handful of pilot projects.

In the mid-1960s, Garda Bowman and Gordon Klopf of the Bank Street College of Education studied 15 federally funded (OEO) programs demonstrating the use of auxiliary personnel in the schools (Bowman and Klopf, 1968). At the sites examined, different ways had been developed and applied for training poverty-level, community-based high school graduates to become classroom aides. The programs combined theoretical instruction with learning through experience in a practicum or regular school classroom; all were committed to experimenting with aides in new functions directly as well as indirectly related to the instructional processs. For the times, the 15 programs were remarkably advanced. All were carefully planned with the local school systems, and all were rigorously managed. They even included a "self-evaluation component." Klopf and Bowman summarized:

> 1) the auxiliaries reported a new feeling of confidence, hope, and aspiration; 2) the teacher-participants in most of the projects expressed a changed in their image of poor people, which paralleled and reinforced the auxiliaries' improved self-image; 3) both types of participants agreed that low-income auxiliaries could facilitate communication with pupils and their parents in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, even to the point of eliciting a twinge of jealousy from some of the teacher participants; and 4) there was general agreement

> among the teachers and auxiliaries that the latter could, when trained and encouraged to do so, contribute to the learning-teaching process, and that their activities should, therefore, not be restricted to routine clerical or custodial functions, *provided* the selection criteria utilized were consistent with a broad role concept.

This was evidence, firsthand and solid, and it found its way directly into the expanding body of evidence on training for paraprofessionals as well as into the conceptualization of COP. But the most important finding for COP purposes was an inauspicious one: while training and role development contributed heavily to the effectiveness of the aides in the classroom, the authors found the anxiety of many of the participants about their eventual employment was a gnawing, disruptive morale factor. Their conclusion: "The training demonstration proved its point, but the question remains—*training for what*; for temporary, uncertain, dead-end jobs, or for stable, open-ended employment?" The answer is built into the question. Career advancement is the obvious critical element. The aspiring paraprofessional must have mobility incorporated into his or her job description.

A tentative step came in 1967 with the establishment of supplementary college and university training arrangements for paraprofessionals employed in Head Start. The participants liked the idea, and most were pleased with their easy access to self-improvement. The dropout rate was remarkably low even though many of the trainees had been out of school for decades and were not subject to the conflicting demands of job, study, and home duties. Many achieved the two-year degree of Associate of Arts (AA). But advancement on the job did not always follow automatically for the new AA-holders, and Head Start created a Career Development Program for its aides. Trained counselors intervened between paraprofessional and employer to help the trainees to advance as their skills increased through training. The device helped produce many of the better classroom teachers in the Nation's schools (W. Anderson, 1972).

The Minneapolis Career Ladder

The idea of a "career ladder," which implies vertical mobility by defined stages, had been advanced in 1965 by Pearl and Reissman, and the first city to adopt one for its school-based paraprofessionals was Minneapolis, where the Youth Development Program initiated an arrangement in one school in 1964. The following year, an Urban Area Summer School financed by the Economic Opportunity Act employed 126 low-income aides in 16 elementary schools with such success that a regular school-year program was instituted with title I funds. Teachers who were asking "What do I do with a paraprofessional?" when the summer school began, were soon reportedly asking "What would I do without a paraprofessional?" (Sweet, 1974-75). Two hundred low-income, neighborhood paraprofessionals were hired for the schools in the fall of 1965, and the Minneapolis program was off and running.

The Minneapolis project slipped into high gear, Director Alan Sweet writes, with the incorporation of the New Careers Program and the Career Opportunities Program in 1967 and 1970. These brought in an even more workable number of participants and provided additional training opportunities. The project also sparked the adoption of a career ladder. An embryonic ladder was initiated in the spring of 1968 spanning three levels within 2 years: Aide I (the entry level), Aide II, and Assistant (in four possible educational fields). This culminated in a comprehensive Minneapolis paraprofessional "career lattice," permitting horizontal as well as vertical mobility, which was defined by COP and adopted by the local board of education to cover all paraprofessional personnel, and which later served as the model when the program came under the Minneapolis civil service. It numbers four broad categories: Teacher Aide, Social Work Aide, Media Aide, and Counselor Aide. There are three classifications (Aide I, Aide II, and Assistant) under each category, with six salary steps in each classification. The lattice includes not only heirarchically defined tasks and selection criteria, but training and transfer opportunities, fringe benefits, and a salary schedule (Bennett and Falk, 1970). A similar model was to have been developed by all COP projects throughout the country. If and when accepted, of course, these lattice-ladders were to be the main vehicles for the career advancement—and security—of a paraprofessional in the school system. At most COP projects, the story was a heartening one: COP sold many school systems on institutionalizing the means to advancement for paraprofessionals. At others, to phrase it delicately, neither the schools nor the "cooperating" institutions of higher education were quite ready for systemwide career ladders or lattices.

In the aggregate, though, evidence as to the importance of career mobility was growing. An exhaustive study of the Minneapolis New Careers Program showed that education and the opportunity for advancement not only contributed to the effectiveness of the service but also to the enhancement of the participants' own self-image. To the surprise of many, the study discovered that, on the average, new careerists performed better than most junior college students and almost as well as university students (Bennett and Falk, 1970). Furthermore, in a review of college programs for paraprofessionals in 1970, Gartner and Johnson found that 60 percent of the paraprofessionals did as well as, and 20 percent better than, ordinary students enrolled in similar courses. Additional studies found the dropout rate significantly lower for paraprofessionals. All of these findings have been borne out by the COP experience; college faculty and administrators across the board would agree with the conclusion of two of the Minneapolis survey leaders that

> . . . the desire for education was the real sleeper of this particular program. Although the recruits were a relatively unselected group of marginally employed low-income adults who were not screened for any educational aptitude, the program tapped a deep vein of interest in higher education. These people were not unaware of the gate-keeping functions of education. (Bennett and Falk, 1970.)

In its purposive encouragement of upward mobility, the Minneapolis program was far ahead of most paraprofessional programs in the country. Many, in fact, scarcely deserved to be called programs; rather, they were widely dispersed clusters of teachers' helpers functioning with neither central direction nor guiding philosophies.

In her doctoral dissertation (University of Massachusetts) covering 1,065 school systems with paraprofessional programs, Jorie L. Mark found little evidence that paraprofessionals in general are making career advances. Only one-sixth of the 135,809 paraprofessionals studied were actually enrolled in institutions of higher education. Since many of these were COP participants, the total would have been considerably lower without COP. (Mark, 1975.)

For its powerful part in acclimating communities of urban America to the virtues of teacher aides in their schools, the largest ESEA Title I teacher aide effort, uncoordinated and patchy though it was, merits COP's gratitude. The practice of having auxiliary personnel in low-income classrooms was a boon to the paraprofessional movement in education and to the work of COP's architects a few years later. It built and improved on the Bay City experience in a technical sense, and it opened new prospects for long overdue social action. But the presence of aides in the classroom did not necessarily mean acceptance or approval of the concept, and the initial response was mixed. Federal funds were not to be refused, however, so aides were added to classes, often at random, to work for teachers who were frequently unprepared and sometimes downright unwilling to receive them.

The Profession Reacts

In 1966, there were roughly 80,000 classroom paraprofessionals in American schools. The figure had risen to 200,000 within 4 years and to 300,000 by 1973. One estimate of the future made in 1972 projected a total of 1.5 million by 1977 (Landsmann, 1973; "Paraprofessionals and Reading," 1973). Although the 1.5 million figure may be unrealistic in view of budgetary retrenchment throughout education in the mid-1970s, it is surely achievable by the early 1980s.

This phenomenal growth has had important repercussions within the teaching profession. At first, as the initial response to the Bay City experiment revealed, many educators hoped that the movement would abort, chiefly because of the threat it seemed to pose to an established profession. But as paraprofessionalism in education grew, attempts were made to control and direct it. By 1969, two researchers reported that the statutes and practices of the States were in flux. Only 10 States had laws on the employment and functions of paraprofessionals; and 11 more had developed some kind of policy or guideline. Of the remaining 29, 7 were working on policies but the other 22 were inert. Those with policies ranged from extreme rigidity—one listed 107 functions to be performed by aides, others would not permit them to supervise study-halls—to extreme flexibility. This utter lack of consistency and direction added to the concerns of the profession, and worry was expressed that some States were permitting and even encouraging aides to commit the unpardonable act of teaching without proper credentials (Tanner and Tanner, 1969).

The ambivalence of the teaching profession found an echo in the teachers' unions. As time passed and the teacher aide proved to be a lasting presence rather than a passing fancy, the unions came to view the movement as a possible source of political strength within their organization. Albert Shanker, president of the United Federation of Teachers (UFT) in New York, was one of the first to recognize the advantages of having paraprofessionals in the union. In the spring of 1970, when 4,000 paraprofessionals working in the lower elementary grades in New York City threatened to strike against inadequate salaries and benefits, the teachers voted three to one to honor their picket lines. The subsequently renegotiated contract nearly tripled paraprofessionals' earnings. Included in this contract was a college training program which called for release time during the school year and stipends for summer study (Gudridge, 1972).

In the UFT, paraprofessionals have equal rights. They can run for any office and can serve as delegates to State and national conventions. The parent organization, the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), has been slower to define the paraprofessional position within the organization, allowing more latitude to local initiative. But AFT, headed by Shanker since late 1974, actively recruits paraprofessionals and promotes demonstrations of their usefulness in the schools (Landsmann, 1973).

The National Education Association (NEA) has used a different approach. Aides have been welcome to join the association in most States, usually as associate members. In 1971, the NEA Representative Assembly voted to admit paraprofessionals in a separate category, allowing all rights and privileges except those of holding office and being represented in the assembly, and to reduce their dues to $12.50 (1975). Their organization would be left to local and State initiative, and a coordinating committee would mesh the programs at the national level. Both the NEA and UFT approaches work effectively at the local level, although the AFT's approach is calculated to develop greater awareness of union affiliation. The place of paraprofessionals in these teacher-dominated organizations is becoming stronger. It will doubtless evolve as the rapidly expanding AFT becomes a leading element in the growing public service union movement in the country.

On the Firing Lines: In the Schools and Colleges

While unions and teacher associations were beginning to embrace the paraprofessionals, if not necessarily their cause, many educators still refused to grant them more than menial status in the classroom. As late as 1969, there were those who stated authoritatively that the function of teacher assistants was to relieve teachers of *nonteaching* duties. The Bay City model died hard.

The Minneapolis school system, as hospitable to paraprofessionals as the city itself, provides a good example of the evolution of teacher aides in one city where staffs were willing to experiment and the school system supported their efforts. Starting with only eight aides in the schools in the early sixties, the city in 1972 had more than 1,000 working with 60,000 children in its schools. In 1966, approximately 50 percent of the aides' time was spent on routine duties, 24 percent on supervision of pupils in large groups, 22 percent on giving personal attention to individual pupils or to small groups, and the remaining 4 percent on other activities. Six years later, aides were spending far less time on routine clerical tasks; 70 percent said they spent more than half their time working directly with children (Tanner and Tanner, 1969). A study in title I schools reported that aides spent a great deal of time in instructional and behavioral areas. Furthermore, when teachers in these Minneapolis schools were asked what they thought aides should be doing, they stated strongly that they should perform activities requiring contact with children in learning and behavioral situations (Johnson and Faunce, 1973).

One key to the constructive use of teacher aides in Minneapolis lies in the orientation program that has been developed. Alan Sweet, the program's director, points out: "The key to the successful utilization of a paraprofessional is that the teacher actually accepts and implements the role change. If teachers continue to teach and manage classrooms as they did before, the overall impact is minimal." Consequently, at COP's urging, all teachers in schools with teacher aides received orientation and training in the supervision and evaluation of paraprofessionals. This has enabled them to develop the kinds of teacher/paraprofessional team relationships that deliver the best and most relevant educational services to the students.

At all levels of the public schools, the entire array of new approaches to teaching methods and organization has tended to spur the more creative use of teacher aides. The nongraded school, open classrooms, and team teaching are singularly appropriate arenas for the use of aides. So, too, are such developments as individualized and small group instruction, microteaching, and performance- or competency-based instruction.

And, almost without exception, these innovations point to a system of "differentiated staffing" under which tasks are assigned according to special abilities. No one teacher has to do it all, as in the traditional classroom system, which is gradually becoming outmoded. The "gradually" would probably be "rapidly" were enough funds available to replace decaying school facilities with the kinds of architecture and construction that tends to stimulate innovation. Wherever these are used, though, differentiated staffing arrangements require teams of different role players headed by master teachers or supervisors. This has led to new needs in teacher training, especially in the inservice upgrading of regular teachers to enable them to supervise other adults in the classroom. For all of its virtues, though, differentiated staffing requires close scrutiny. Poorly or insensitively administered, it could lead to a hardening of distinct staff roles and a consequent "tracking" which may prove incompatible with the lattices and ladders of the COP and paraprofessional worlds.

A variety of new structural arrangements for administering schools and developing staff competence has appeared since the mid-fifties. All now include teacher aides. All are centered on providing training for every staff member. Bearing different labels—individually guided education (IGE), portal schools, and multiunit schools, among others—they are based in varying but always significant degrees on building-wide staff development tailored to the needs of the school and community. The aide is an integral element, although essentially in that role rather than as a future full professional. At 26 sites around the country, too, one of COP's companion programs, the Urban/Rural School Development Program, is premised on the notion that the smallest unit of educational change is the school building and that training of staff personnel to meet needs determined by the community is the principal means to accomplish reform. Again, teacher aides are usually part of the design; in cases where geography permits, the paraprofessionals may be the trainees of a nearby COP project.

Teacher training institutions have generally been the slowest to accommodate to these departures from the norm. Complaints abound throughout education and elsewhere that departments of education remain bastions of conservatism. Many, of course, have transformed their outlooks and are immersed in new ways of doing things with and for new groups. An even larger group senses new kinds of relations and changes in the offing and is girding itself for them. But hundreds more are all but oblivious. Teacher education in such departments has been called a program about educational philosophy, social foundations, evaluation, and audio-visual aids, with a traumatic, learn-by-doing finale called student teaching. Education departments are more willing than most other university departments to carry uncommitted students, who seriously hamper any program, a condition attested by inordinately high dropout rates from the profession. In the State of Washington, over half of those licensed in 1965 had dropped out of teaching by 1969. Worse yet, many of the new ways of doing things that have been instituted are the result of outside funding or faddishness and are superficial. In the great mass of still-traditional departments, there is little evidence of commitments to link ideologies to classroom problems, or to provide and test examples of the new media and technology.

The preparation of mature, low-income teacher aides such as COP trainees for both better performances as auxiliaries and career advancement to the ranks of certified teachers struck some institutions as an intrinsically good idea. It was different and a possible lode of untapped Federal resources, complete with faculty positions, administrative posts, "overhead" expenses, and even supplies and technology. To others, the challenge was larger. Without abandoning the chronic concerns over stability and material prosperity that pervade all institutions of higher education, these institutions saw the mission of training aides as opening possible new routes to teacher training. They viewed it, too, as an opportunity for involvement in the educational affairs of long-ignored communities and as an introduction to new breeds of students. For all too many others, the training of aides, regardless of who was footing the bill, detracted from the professionalism of the teaching profession. Many "name" schools cared little about teacher aides. They cared even less about delivering services, under contract, to school systems which could often not boast a single staff doctorate. This was the culture into which COP was dropped in mid-1970.

The modern incarnation of educational paraprofessionalism has advanced far beyond its middle-class origins in Bay City. As the teacher aide gains stature, it is important to remember that the chief impetus came from the introduction of thousands of low-income paraprofessionals into poverty-area schools. The key shift in the role of the paraprofessional derived from the central assumption that adults from the same communities and backgrounds as the pupils would add an important dimension to their learning and adjustment in classes still taught largely by middle-class teachers. The poor, it has been avowed, can best serve the poor. And, says Pearl, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville confrontation of 1968 would not have occurred had the teachers in those schools come from the community.

The new neighborhood paraprofessionals are found not only in the regular public school classroom but in programs like Head Star, Follow Through, special reading projects, bilingual education, and adult education. More than 27,000 are employed in special education programs throughout the country, where they significantly increase individualized instruction to handicapped children, many of whom are now being "mainstreamed" into regular classrooms (NCTL, 1974). In all of these areas, the paraprofessional provides resources and understanding that the professional may lack, bringing to the school local contact that the commuting teacher has neither time nor predilection to create. Furthermore, the paraprofessional has the potential to exercise leadership for significant change within the community because, to quote Pearl, "The paraprofessional, much more than the professional, is incensed with institutional inequities, is allied with students and parents and is a part of a grassroots political movement." It is these factors, he concludes, that make the paraprofessional a key to education reform.

A 1970 study by the Institute for Educational Development described a typical paraprofessional in New York City working under a Title I, ESEA program, as:

> A 35-year-old married, black woman with two children at home; her wages as a paraprofessional contribute less than half of the $6,500 earned by the family; she has no paid employment other than her work as an aide, has a high school diploma, works 22 hours a week as an educational assistant in a district decentralized ESEA Title I project at an elementary school, and spends almost all of her working time with black and Puerto Rican children and parents. She lives within a few city blocks of most of the pupils and parents she works with and has many informal contacts with them outside of school.
>
> She is in her first or second year of employment as an educational assistant. She assists a third-grade teacher, spending most of her time in the classroom working directly with students, teaching and tutoring them in language arts, and to a lesser extent, mathematics. She is not required to use a foreign language in her work and knows no language other than English. She received no advance training for the job, but since becoming a paraprofessional, has received more than five weeks of part-time training, which is continuing. Perhaps the most important part of her training is the continuing supervision and help she gets from the classroom teacher to whom she is assigned. (IED, 1970.)

Can such persons contribute to the educational process? Can poverty-enmeshed Black, Chicano, or American Indian mothers with little formal education help the children of their neighborhoods or reservations in their losing battles with unresponsive schools? Partial answers are available. One study of an aide program in Kentucky, conducted by the University of Virginia's School of Education, found that "the educational backgrounds of the aides were not consequential in predicting the ratings which the supervising teachers would make concerning the aides." A Washington, D.C., program reported similar findings, while a large-scale New York City study went even farther:

> The age, sex, marital status, number of children, racial or ethnic background, income, education, previous job experience, or years of residence in New York City were *not* connected with whether a paraprofessional was rated as "most effective" or "least effective" by the school principal. These findings suggest that a very broad band of the population can be considered eligible for paraprofessional work. (IED, 1970.)

Still other studies have reported that pupil performance rose appreciably when indigenous paraprofessionals were used. And evidence was gathering that aides from the same backgrounds as the pupils were making singular contributions in the classroom and in the community. Gartner (1971) reported studies conducted in Minnesota, Kentucky, California, and Georgia which show that paraprofessionals had an effect on gains in reading, increases in "verbalization" by children, and more child-to-child interaction. Findings from programs in Minnesota, North Carolina, and Wisconsin indicated that paraprofessionals released teachers to spend more time with individual students, increased preparation time, and resulted in instructional improvement. An astonishing conclusion reached by an OEO-sponsored adult education experiment was that indigenous paraprofessionals without a college education had actually been more effective in helping to raise reading scores of adult participants than either certified remedial education teachers or college graduates (Gartner , 1971).

The most convincing evidence of the beneficial effects of paraprofessionals comes from an exploration of their roles in New York City schools in 1969-70 by the Institute for Educational Development. This exhaustive study first developed the profile cited earlier, then surveyed the type of work paraprofessionals did, and finally, their impact. The ten most frequently cited activities from a checklist of 175 items proved to be nearly all pupil-related: talking quietly to a child who is upset or disturbing the class; stopping arguments and fights among students; assisting pupils with learning drills; going over a paper with a child; listening to children tell stories, spell, give reports, or talk about their school work and their problems; explaining school rules; and correcting homework papers. The first item, talking to an unruly child, was also checked by three-quarters of all principals and teachers interviewed as the most valuable activity on a list of 19, which indicates a remarkably good match between job expectations and job performance.

The IED study reported that the paraprofessionals liked their work and had no thought of changing jobs. For the majority, it was their most important job ever. This came through clearly to the pupils as well. Nearly all said paraprofessionals enjoyed working with them. Moreover, it was found that the aides had more positive attitudes toward school and were spending more time with community people and in community organizations.

Higher school achievement was the most important effect of the program on pupils in almost half the schools. About 90 percent said that they enjoyed coming to school more than formerly, and about 75 percent of the junior high pupils thought the school was doing a better job of teaching since paraprofessionals arrived. Pupils' attitudes had improved, school attendance was better, and parents said their children were more interested in school work. Teachers were enthusiastic and reported a better relationship with their pupils and a better understanding of the surrounding community. Most also felt they were using new skills and accomplishing more. Principals agreed with these impressions: most felt that their relations with parents and community groups were better. Parents, too, remarked on the influence of these community-based aides. They found that schools had improved and that they had developed new perceptions about dealing with their children at home. Thirty-five percent said they were participating more often in school activities as well.

In conclusion, the IED study declared, "Whatever may be wrong with the paraprofessional program, none of it can outweigh what IED found about its success. Wherever we looked—at the kind of people employed as paraprofessionals, at the kind of work they are given, or at the impact they have on their targets—the programs looked extraordinarily good."

Chapter 3. The Birth of a Program

The System Prepares

Even before COP was devised, the underlying commonalities of virtually all of the new EPDA programs were beginning to emerge. Some were derived from the professional experience and personal backgrounds of non-USOE experts as well as of the new administrators, some of them recruited from the outside world of State departments of education, colleges and universities, associations, and public schools. Some of the common themes were based on the dynamic realities of the 1960s, particularly the scandalously belated discovery of the poor. Still others arose from growing research-based evidence that the large world of preparing educators was overdue for surgical change. And at least one, the vital notion of parity or "mutual collaboration and decision making by those who give and those who receive the services" had deep roots in the turmoil of the decade which had preceded COP.

The early days of the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (BEPD), established in February 1968 to administer all but a small portion of EPDA program activity, were heady ones. While the Great Society had admittedly run its course, much of what had been learned in its 4 years was still there to be used, though Vietnam threatened to demoralize and bankrupt the larger society that had created it. The forces unleashed by the great domestic programs of the 1960s remained as formidable as ever, but intense national preoccupation with the strangest war in recent history, two devastating political assassinations, and the curious chain of events that forced Lyndon Johnson to the political sidelines had established a set of conditions under which a substantial degree of confusion and administrative inconsistency would have been understandable. To the credit of EPDA's administrators (with Don Davies, Associate Commissioner, BEPD/USOE, at the helm) there was almost none. Subjected though they were to the often illogical demands and practices of a sloppily expanding but regulation-bound Federal educational bureaucracy, they stuck to their central themes, and an astonishingly high quotient of ideological consistency was registered. With only occasional minor shifts in emphasis, the main EPDA programs, with COP in the vanguard, were characterized by four basic features:

1. *Poor, minority, and alienated groups were to constitute the prime focus of BEPD's new programs.* The decision to take this route held firm throughout the life of the Bureau and of the legislative authority it possessed. At one point in the planning process that culminated in the creation of BEPD, a so-called Think Group chaired by Don Davies' future deputy, Russell Wood, recommended that the "economically disadvantaged" should receive as much as 30 to 40 percent of the funds to be administered. Even this suggestion, which already exceeded any purely literal interpretation of the legislation, was rejected as being insufficient. Almost the whole EPDA/BEPD canvas was to be painted in the colors of the poor and the dispossessed minorities of America. Related to this, and no less important in the BEPD profile, was an uncompromising adherence to the view that training should, wherever possible, strengthen individual and group identity, especially minority cultural and linguistic patterns. The new administrators thus placed themselves squarely in opposition to the dominance of white, middle-class values in the training of educators. The social and political implications of training teachers to teach American children Spanish as their first language, revivify long-dormant Indian tribal lore, or paint murals depicting the less popular footnotes to Black history were and remain enormous. The "cutting edge" program for all of this was, of course, COP.

2. *Training as a catalyst of school reform was, from the launching of EPDA, a fundamental tenet of the BEPD value system.* It could hardly have been otherwise, for the creation and installation of major programs to improve the performance of school staffs had to be linked tightly to the immediate context of the school and its function, and the staffs themselves had to be involved, substantively and even managerially, in the training process. School reform would never occur, BEPD reasoning went, unless the individuals staffing education institutions were equipped to deal with all of the settings and circumstances in which learning occurs.

3. *Partnerships ("parity") among participating groups, with close links among schools, colleges, and communities being served, were explicitly urged by BEPD.* The idea had begun to gain currency in programs predating COP. The TTT (Trainers of Teacher Trainers) effort, a program initiated in anticipation of becoming a big part of the BEPD design, had experimented with parity a year or two before the rest, and Teacher Corps had achieved uneven results with parity in the late 1960s. In different programs, parity took different outcomes. In COP, as will be described later, the parity net often included the local Model Cities agency, an excellent early source of needed funds and an important actor on the urban scene. Whether or not the concept of parity was a smashing success—

and scattered returns indicate that it enjoyed both success and failure, and was accompanied by major psychological adjustments in either case—its early no-nonsense institutionalization in the BEPD scheme of things represented clear recognition of a dramatically new precept for a Federal education effort.

4. *Varying the supply and career patterns of people to staff the schools was basic.* The Pearl-Riessman dicta in *New Careers for the Poor*, calling for the "disadvantaged" not only to hold jobs but to carve public service careers, influenced BEPD's attitudes. Almost equally significant was the growing movement, which transcended the boundaries of economic class, to introduce new kinds of roles and role-holders into the schools. Under an umbrella loosely labeled "differentiated staffing," teacher aides, team teaching, flexible scheduling, the use of noncredentialed specialists, and other largely unclassified people and trends were gathered together. All would at one point or another find their way comfortably into the BEPD and COP stables.

In the 1967-69 period, as the BEPD ideological framework was being roughed in, additional components were introduced, some for bureaucratic reasons and others because they appeared to make educational sense. Almost from the beginning, the Bureau was searching for a design that would somehow combine the best features of the most successful training enterprises around the country. At various times, the formula bore the label of training complexes or renewal centers or teacher centers, the latter a model which demonstrated good staying power. If they were not in the mainstream of BEPD's "bread and butter" programs, they were not far from it. Another weighty plank in the Bureau's doctrinal platform was the commitment to helping to prepare teachers to deal, *in the regular classroom wherever possible*, with children with learning and behavioral problems. And, spurring a movement given impetus by Teacher Corps, the Bureau's leaders demonstrated a willingness to challenge long-accepted but increasingly vulnerable practices regarding courses, licensing, accreditation, and other traditional features of university-centered teacher training. Both the concentration on handicapped children and the burgeoning movement toward performance- or competency-based teacher education found their way into many of COP's 132 projects.

With the Bureau's broad doctrinal lines in place, the birth of the COP idea could proceed reasonably unobstructed. Two planning groups, Russell Wood's in-house "EPDA Think Group" and an external "Planning Coordination Committee" headed by Dwight Allen, then of Stanford University, were hard at work by late 1967, framing a seemingly endless collection of organizational prescriptions, thematic messages, thoughts about "target groups," and recommendations for specific programs. It was a time of bureaucratic gamesmanship. The long-desired

Education Professions Development Act was on the books, and the ideological base was solidifying; but nothing was happening. At the start there was almost no money (nor, perhaps, should there have been); when it came, it was less than expected and far more heavily committed to legislatively earmarked or inherited arrangements than even the cadre of the internal Think Group may have realized. The chemistry among the incoming Davies, Teacher Corps' feisty Richard Graham, Donald Bigelow, who headed USOE's existing teacher training programs with high distinction, and Russell Wood was unpredictable—at times, explosive. Personnel "slots" were not readily available, and even office space was at a premium. As one functionary asked, "So what else is new?" The system was indeed preparing, but neither smoothly nor comfortably.

Yet the path to COP appeared remarkably unobstructed. For reasons on which no two knowledgeable sources fully agree, COP, albeit far from secure, appears to have enjoyed a relatively protected status. It emerged early as EPDA's favored blueprint for the future. For one thing, COP embraced most of the properties BEPD's planners had envisaged for the programs that the new authority would generate. For another, it was new, completely and unmistakably free of debt to the past, and as topical as a federally-underwritten education program could be. Some observers have called COP Davies' personal "lay-on," a charge that could hardly be refuted by his known biases in favor of teacher aides, a larger role for the school in training, differentiated staffing, and programs for the poor. The charge, nonetheless, implied a degree of favoritism that was out of character for this administrator. The fact was, though, that most of BEPD's main educational and social concerns could be assembled under COP's roof. There was little doubt in USOE that the paraprofessional program enjoyed a special-priority niche from which it would not be easily dislodged.

To the BEPD groups designing the COP experiment, its central themes were a logical extension of the Bureau's own guiding precepts. Davies has stated seven of them:

1. Reducing to a minimum the formal requirements for entering a paraprofessional training program and a first job.
2. Bringing work and training, and theory and practice together.
3. Designing and setting in motion career ladders that would permit personal advancement from dead-end jobs.
4. Developing and adapting specific procedures called "career lattices," which would provide rewards and variety within the world of the paraprofessionals.
5. Drawing minority and other poor people in the human service agencies and creating conditions for rewarding employment with opportunities for advancement.

6. Changing training and certification requirements to permit credits for experience, for on-the-job training and learning, and for the ability to demonstrate knowledge or skill without taking a course.
7. Promoting the notion of differentiated staffing by recognizing the varying talents and interests of a school staff and the varying, diverse needs of the children to be served. (Davies, 1974.)

All that remained, in theory at least, was to do it. To the surprise of no one with any knowledge of Federal attempts to deliver human services, doing something was far more difficult than talking about it. Emboldened by the position of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development that the needs of low-income children merited the "highest priority," still another internal task force directed by Wood had urged, in the Commissioner's report of 1968 on the status of the education professions, the early creation of a COP program. The recommendation drew a predictably favorable reaction, and the new BEPD began serious organizational planning for COP in late 1968.

Parity at the Top

By early 1969, preparations for the formal christening of COP a year and a half in the future had added a new dimension. A group of nongovernmental experts of remarkably varied backgrounds and interests had been assembled and constituted as a self-described "National Panel of Advisors" for COP. Broadly representative of the education professions and the groups to whom COP's message would be directed, the body was shortly thereafter retooled to become, with minor changes, the COP Leadership Training Institute (LTI). To support its many-sided endeavors in training project staffs and in providing technical assistance, it received a USOE grant of close to $200,000.

In August 1969, the COP LTI and BEPD sponsored a tumultuous conference in Denver at which all aspects of the forthcoming COP program were treated in an atmosphere variously described by participants as "a shambles," "thrilling," "mind blowing," "disgusting," and even "stimulating." By this time, COP's operational guidelines had been drafted and discussed *ad infinitum* at an earlier Washington conference, and formal action to set the COP mechanism in motion was not far off. Four, small, experimental, pre-COP "special projects" were being set up in California and a fifth in New York State. More important, BEPD and the States had already identified the 250 school districts in the United States that had the heaviest concentrations of low-income residents. All 250 were invited to submit 5-page concept papers that would describe their need for a COP-type effort, current activity regarding teacher aides, and their capacity to mount COP projects. Of the 250, 130 were selected as COP sites. It was the representatives of the 130 selected projects who, along with diverse educational and human services experts, nonfederal government officials, and what one participant said was "a mob of others" (300 invitees, 800 participants), gave the Denver assembly its passionate character. The session was replete with political power jockeying, ethnic caucuses, and the issues and lifestyles of the times. A Model Cities representative wondered aloud whether his Federal agency should put a penny into COP; in nearly the same breath, he noted that "these are my kind of people." Model Cities support, arranged in a subsequent interagency "treaty" between the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and HEW ultimately became a central source of funding for COP.

Whatever its virtues or shortcomings, the LTI symbolized something much more important than the provision of technical assistance to COP. Perhaps unwittingly, in gathering a polyglot group together and formally labeling it an Institute (a step subsequently taken by most of BEPD's other programs), the Bureau effectively committed *itself* rather than only its funded projects to a near-total involvement in parity. The habit of "mutual collaborative decisionmaking by those who give and those who receive the service" was thus publicly introduced directly into COP's national policy apparatus. The repercussions were felt throughout the COP system. From the first day of a COP project's life, its governance was expected to be participatory, even though messiness and ambiguity could and often did result. And in this one respect, the COP main office had already shown its willingness to take a highly significant, possible fateful, first step.

The COP scheme of things embraced a galaxy of institutional ties. One that was of enormous material support and was to be built into the COP urban site model was the relationship with Model Cities. At least 30 percent of COP's money went to projects located in Model Cities neighborhoods, where the Model Cities agency contributed financially and participated substantively. Coordination with other Federal programs was also officially encouraged in COP's guidelines and by the Washington administrators. Tangible prospects for building such linkages were only rarely spelled out. Federal project directors in the field are as reluctant as their Washington program managers to contribute hard-won resources to other causes, however closely related to theirs, and successful resistance to pressures to do so is a mark of honor in the grants society. Before COP was a year old, however, hard-won resources were regularly being contributed to COP projects, and collaborative ties resulted that will be long in breaking.

Another category of unanticipated tie was the addition of new functions or programmatic relationships. One such was the COP Veterans Corps, the offshoot of a combination of bureaucratic infighting and political "lay-on." The struggle within the system was for control of a small Veterans in Public Service Program, a freshman-sophomore internship which was Teacher Corps' acknowledgment of developing national pressures to "do something" for returning Vietnam-era veterans. Direction of the program was assumed by COP, which at one point actually promised it as much as 40 percent of its funds the 1st year and 20 percent thereafter. Although a widespread impression persisted that one of every five COP trainees was a Vietnam-era veteran, the actual proportion was considerably lower, on the order of one in ten. Those who did enter the COP program—an all-Black, 42-participant project at Xavier University in New Orleans is an excellent example—brought wisdom and maturity beyond their years. They proved to be such a valuable COP resource, in fact, that a separate entity, the Veterans and Project Directors Development Assistance Project, was created to harness their energies and those of the COP project directors for COP-wide troubleshooting tasks.

On a different plane, technically outside the organizational mold of the COP projects but linked to them, were COP's connections to the States. Introduced into the COP processes well before the program was begun, coordinators drawn from the State departments of education were the initial points of administrative contact at the sub-Federal level. Their initial function was nothing less than the major role in recommending project sites within the States, a process that deposited the State education departments squarely in the middle of COP country. Armed with annual COP grants of their own which averaged approximately $10,000 per medium- or large-sized State, the States were charged with a variety of activities affecting the COP sites within their borders. The activities of the coordinators ranged from occasional consultation through comprehensive technical assistance, from construction of interproject relationships, through theme-based State-level training conferences, and the publication of informative materials to, in some cases, active searches for supplementary funds for individual COP sites.

No two States took the same tack. Nor could they. Relationships and responsibilities were too often dictated by laws and administrative practices peculiar to the particular State. In Idaho, for example, the coordinator was also the director of the only COP project in the State and chairman of the national COP State Coordinators Council, a body funded separately by USOE to promote consistent interstate practices and consultation on COP matters. Elsewhere in the COP network, State coordinators were usually either the overall EPDA coordinator at the State level or were strategically placed in the sector of their department concerned with teacher training, certification, or, in some cases, higher education.

It may never be possible to assess the impact of the State on the national COP scene. This impact was probably far less than some States would have wished but more substantial, in many instances, than the Federal administrators felt was necessary. At the lower end of the spectrum, the State had little impact of either a positive or a negative kind; from the middle up, it ranged from moderately helpful to enormously beneficial. For every State that all but ignored COP, there was another, like West Virginia, which immersed itself in the issues of paraprofessionals, staged nationally attended conferences on vitally important COP issues, and initiated actions that would lead to new modes of licensing and certification. Or Ohio, which diligently molded its four COP projects into an interdependent grid, achieved high and useful exposure for COP, and was always ready to help out. The help sometimes even took the form of money.

The Federal Stewardship

An informal survey conducted within BEPD in 1972 revealed that its staff possessed higher educational qualifications than the personnel of most comparable Federal bureaus. It revealed that most of the Bureau's professional-level functionaries had had some experience in the kinds of settings and institutions in which BEPD grant recipients worked. Some were regarded as national authorities. Surprisingly for new programs like COP, the statistics also indicated that the typical BEPD staffer had put together somewhat more than 10 years of Federal service, an asset whose value is substantially more difficult to estimate with any exactitude, but surely a boon in terms of rope knowledge, survival techniques, and general organizational experience accruing to the program. The combination of relevant background, prior experience and standing in client-linked affairs, and enough understanding of the system to test the water before plunging in augured well for COP. Add to this mixture an uncomplicated COP internal hierarchy headed by two distinguished Black educators totally committed to the COP idea and, to adapt a metaphor from the time of the moon landing in 1969, all systems should have been go.

But were they? Could the larger system even tolerate, let alone use, this unique amalgam? The quick response: only occasionally. Although the program was funded at an annual average of $23 million, the COP program's Washington unit unfurled the COP flag with but 12 staff members aboard. The flow of money for staff travel, outside consultants, technical assistance, and the array of services that a credible organization demands was fitful. Sometimes the new COP branch was awash in it; for the most part, and usually when it was needed most, there was very little, or none. Even the amenities of adequate office surroundings and secretarial help were only unevenly available. Project-monitoring visits by staff professionals could seldom be planned in the certainty that they would take place. These were not boondoggles to the Nation's more prosperous conference/resort centers; they were grueling day-and-night working sessions in the most downtrodden quarters of urban and rural America. Unlike Teacher Corps, which managed at least two and sometimes three or four visits annually to each of its 70-75 sites and boasted a staff of almost 60 for a program with a 1969-70 budget of but $20 million, COP's Washington operation was held together by scotch tape, chewing gum and fervent prayer. Even the figure of 12 staff members is misleading; there were times when it sank to four.

How, then, to develop the required information, manage the operation, and imbue the sites with the sense of a caring Washington establishment? Here, the reply is an acronym: MIES, the elaborate management Information and Evaluation System invented by Dr. Wilton Anderson, a former member of the LTI, chief of New York City's educational paraprofessional unit, and the incoming (May 1970) head of the COP program. In his own words, MIES was developed in "response to the various shortcomings of present-day evaluation and the specific developmental needs of COP managers on the Federal, State, and local level." In essence, said its creator, "COP-MIES is . . . a problem-solving tool using a systems approach for managing, measuring, and evaluating COP programs." Properly administered, MIES was to be a means to several necessary ends: generating information, evaluating process rather than impact, training senior staff members at COP sites in how to manage their projects (and write new funding proposals), and feeding management-relevant information back to COP locales ("information loops"). At the moment of its birth, then, MIES was intended to serve Washington and project alike. It was to contribute, above all else, to the successful overall development of the program.

The MIES approach was scientific, or at least comprehensive, in that its design encapsulated every conceivable variety of information on COP and, in doing so, employed techniques ranging from extended questionnaires to formal evaluative instruments. It was replete with functional flow diagrams and, at some points in the MIES design, used technical educational jargon that was all but unfathomable. But MIES was and remained a serious effort to get at the principal problems of managing and evaluating COP projects. That the "information loops" quickly became a one-way affair from the projects to Washington, but not vice versa, was probably less an outcome of the MIES system than an artifact of the bureaucratic establishment itself. For reasons mired somewhere in its practices and regulations, the system was simply unable, or possibly unwilling, to provide the new COP program with the resources it required to administer a sorely needed managerial and evaluative system. A truncated version of the MIES task, limited to collecting, collating, and transmitting project data from the field to COP headquarters—with no feedback—was eventually contracted out to a nongovernment agency.

With a staff fluctuating between 4, 9, and 12—depending sometimes on the day of the week—struggling to cope with COP's myriad problems in 132 locations throughout the Nation; and with MIES off to a limping start, the program's administrative leadership in Washington was uneven. One solution, which had been routinely rejected whenever it had surfaced, was for the program to be monitored from the 10 geographical regions at which USOE contingents were part of the larger regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The idea—decentralization, not regionalization, in the parlance of 1972's New Federalism—rests on both political and managerial foundations. Politically, it could be depicted as something like the return of power to the countryside and as a way of bringing government to the people. Managerially, it was described as just plain efficient and cost-effective. Project monitors working closely with COP or other Federal education projects would be almost instantly available for troubleshooting assistance. They could develop an expertise focussed on a limited number of sites rather than attempt to maintain the customary, wide-angle, cross-country, low-resolution vigil. The administrative lines within USOE field offices were short and surprise-free.

But decentralization had hit stormy weather throughout USOE, receiving a notably rough reception in BEPD, where all but a handful of the 200-plus staff members at the time (late 1960s) had seen no future in moving to Kansas City or Seattle—or anywhere else. The action, they sensed, was in Washington. And previous attempts at decentralization of USOE programs had had mixed results; in one case, the well-intentioned civil servants who took the plunge found themselves "recentralized," shipped back to Washington when their projects were returned, for reasons still unknown, to the Washington USOE complex.

In 1972, the administration of HEW Secretary Weinberger declared still another decentralization. This one was different. The Secretary meant business and it worked. The two key programs to be affected were COP and the companion Urban/Rural School Development Program, both of them serving low-income constituencies and both all but guaranteed 5-year lifetimes. A call for volunteers went out, and the quota was oversubscribed. By early 1973, COP has been moved to "the people." The process was deliberately planned and carefully executed. There was no dust to settle. The new monitors—some of them steeped in COP lore, others relative newcomers to COP but thoroughly indoctrinated, and still others recruited direct from the regional offices—quietly took up the new posts and set about reshaping the relationships between Federal office and COP project that would help the COP projects steer their way through the second half of their 5-year cycle. A small USOE staff in Washington continued to monitor COP's "national" projects and to concern itself with issues of a transregional character. And so, halfway into the COP lifetime, a new, far-reaching administrative arrangement established the kinds of enlightened controls the COP network had deserved from the day it was launched. That these new modes usually worked is attested to by the high enthusiasm expressed for them by the projects themselves and by the State coordinators as well, who could have felt threatened by them.

As it acquired form—its substance had long since been shaped and honed—the new COP program should have taken up the problem of how to build a national identity. It should have, but it evidently didn't, for the problem was avoided like the plague. Despite COP's size, responsiveness, and high originality, its launching attracted only scattered public notice. The national media ignored it. The formal inauguration on July 1, 1970, of a major new initiative that would cost $24.3 million, number over 9,000 participants, and directly touch the lives of as many as a quarter of a million school children in its first year, was treated routinely even by the professional education press. The program badly needed broadly based political, professional, and public support. One critic of COP's nonexistent public relations has pointed out that its only support came from "the people already on its payroll—the grantees, the LTI, and the State coordinators. No one in Congress has ever heard of it."

The observation is harsh, but it has some validity. There appears to have been no all-encompassing policy rationale for public relations. In the first place, the kind of public acclaim and congressional support that some of the more fortunately placed, more agile agencies had obtained—to their immense long-run benefit—may have been considered the kind of attention that honest civil servants should not seek; it was against the law and regulations to pursue what was nakedly self-promotional, though the line between self-promotion and the provision of obligatory information is sometimes a parlous matter even for experienced public affairs operatives. And the COP managers were educators, not PR men. Lastly, the absence of any comprehensive public affairs policy rationale has also been accounted for on the basis of the program's political situation: the program was not really an initiative of the incumbent Nixon administration, and calling too much attention to it, either on Capitol Hill or in the public media, would place it in jeopardy. Whatever the reasons, the COP program started off with its light under a bushel and managed to remain unknown, except to its immediate family members and a few relatives, for the rest of its life.

Chapter 4. The Ingredients of a COP Project

From the beginning, COP's human dimensions were what stamped its image and unique traits on 132 locales and 48 States across the Nation. The rewards of adult lives given new meaning and children's learning improved was the stuff of which COP was made. These outcomes were basic, occurring without regard to organizational variations and even in defiance of the omniscient and omnipresent great stone face of the Management Information and Evaluation System. Even so, they could not have eventuated except on the basis of the cultivation of necessary preconditions, and the precise definition of goals and functional modes.

A COP project was a meld of human and organizational behavior. Local practice or custom dictated that no two COP endeavors would look exactly alike. Needs were different, and strengths were unevenly and unpredictably distributed. If one COP site had an exceptionally strong director, another might display a world-beating university coordinator. The gap created by an indifferent superintendent might be plugged by a purposeful, unified community advisory council. Or, as often happened, a determined group of COP participants could be instrumental within a school system in tipping the balance toward effective action. Then again, there were COP sites populated by 36 or 62 or 79 trainees whose personal logistics or inclinations made them 36 or 62 or 79 unconnected human islands in a vast COP sea.

Inescapably, of course, whatever forms they took, all project efforts were ultimately to be judged by their effects on the children of the Nation's most poorly endowed schools. As in any large group, there were a few fore-ordained successes. But, more ordinarily, the potential for success that survives to school age in these children is highly vulnerable. Many or most of the children in these COP settings struck observers as being removed from traditional American mainstreams; poor and increasingly conscious of it; underachievers by traditional criteria; and suspicious or even defeated much too early in life. In hospitable circumstances, they could be willing learners. But bringing that to pass depends upon the most sensitive application of resources, empathetic communication, and hard work.

Addressing themselves to this end in a variety of combinations, the five bedrock ingredients of any COP enterprise are the participants, director, community, schools, and teacher training institution. At many sites, additional entities—Model Cities agencies, State bodies, public foundations, Federal projects, self-help organizations, external funding sources—were introduced into the project design, but these were not integral to the national COP prototype. In what follows, these five basic components are described both in terms of their delineated roles in COP and as interacting segments of a typical project.

* * *

The Heart of the Matter: The COP Participant

The centerpiece of any COP production is the trainee—whether labeled aide, auxiliary, paraprofessional, or intern—around whom all COP activities revolve. The training of this individual is the central purpose of the national COP endeavor. On their success hinged the success of COP. If their efforts yielded pluses on the charts of COP objectives achieved, then COP was worthwhile. For the participant did not represent one of a list of key COP objectives: she (88 percent) or he (12 percent) was the agent whose work determined fulfillment or failure across the entire range. But a word of caution: for all the national-level rhetoric about its innovative and change-oriented goals, COP had no grand designs on the structures of public schools. It could and did question fundamental assumptions, but its arena was the system itself, and acceptance into it had to precede attempts to improve, reform, or change it.

Near the midway point in COP's journey, a national survey revealed that 13,477 persons had participated in the program and 9,343 were then enrolled as full-fledged trainees. Over 86 percent were low-income family heads or members, 63 percent were recruited from various other governmental programs, and 13 percent (this figure dwindled thereafter) were veterans of Vietnam-era military service. More than three-fourths of the trainees were nonwhite (54 percent Black, 14.3 percent Hispanic, 3.7 percent Native American, with the remainder scattered among Asian and other nonwhite categories). Significantly, well over half of all the participants had been drawn from employment within the school system; it may be assumed, in the absence of clear data, that a significant added percentage, perhaps up to ten percent, was employed in other human service fields when COP beckoned. Although the average participant was probably 31 or 32, COP also included teenagers and grandparents well into their sixties.

The language of USOE's COP *Project Director's Handbook* is refreshingly candid. As this quotation demonstrates, development of criteria for serious candidacy was really left up to the projects:

> The Career Opportunities Program is designed to train individuals who have the ability and desire to spend a significant part of their working careers in providing better education for children of low-income families. A commitment toward such a career is not intended to restrict fully the intention of the applicant when he (or she) enters the program.
>
> Participants should be residents of the area served by C.O.P. schools. Where participants are to be newly recruited to the school system, they must come from low-income families. Where present employees are to be C.O.P. participants, preference must be given to those from low-income backgrounds.
>
> Individual participants—veterans and non-veterans—need not have a high school diploma, or the equivalent, but they must meet conditions prescribed by the local school district, based upon the information in this manual, and as described in the proposal application. The individual may have previous college training below the bachelor's level. He, or she, may be single or married. The enrollment of persons from minority ethnic groups is encouraged.

The remarkable people who entered the COP network brought qualities and qualifications that were almost unbelievable. The common personal denominators were the obvious ones described in COP's literature. But scratch the surface, and a typical COP trainee was not necessarily only an upward-bound, 32-year-old, Black, paraprofessional mother of three from a divided family scattered throughout the ghetto. That same superficially typical COP aide may also have dropped out of school at 14 and read three good books a week since. She may have been one of her community's leading activists in housing, busing, voting rights, and compensatory education. And she would certainly have acquired "street smarts" along with some sensitive discernments about race and majority institutions and culture. Above all, her well-developed sense of the needs of minority children was propelling her into the schools and beyond, into the postsecondary education that had never before been possible. With a few adjustments on both sides, COP's reasoning went, this was a future teacher. Not your run-of-the-mill middle-class lady from the suburbs, but "one of us"—Black, poor, and, until recently, without much hope.

The paraprofessionals were probably not as directly involved in operational decisions as many might have wished. As a general rule, the project's hierarchy was already in place and had carried out the better part of the planning function by the time the participants were selected and first made their appearances on the scene. The community advisory council had also been assembled; indeed, in most locales, it had markedly influenced the recruitment and selection processes. Virtually all decisions concerning academic work and even placement in the schools for those not already working in the system had been made. All that evidently remained for the new trainee was to sign on and be processed through the system.

Happily, it did not work that way. The traits that had made degree-seeking paraprofessionals of people who refused to be mired in hopeless job situations were always in demand. Almost from the day of their induction, the trainees were as involved in the affairs of their COP sites as circumstances and time permitted. The COP participant *was* the community, and "surplus" time had to be devoted to family and personal concerns. Release time was hard to come by, with the predictable consequence that COP people led three distinct lives: full-time work in the schools, a crushing academic load, and, because most were mothers, the domestic life that seemed inevitably to be the first to be neglected. The babysitting husband or wife was no rarity in the COP scheme of things.

The full weight of this set of forces sat too heavily on some. Without extraordinary dedication and dexterity, pure logistics could make COP participation "mission impossible," and as many as one-third of those who began lasted less than 1 year. But those who stayed were "something else again." Whether they were destined to make the fabled "difference" in minority/low-income/compensatory education, or to be devoured by insensitive bureaucracies, what they demonstrated in COP's lifetime restores faith in the intrinsic merits of humankind. Leaving analysis to a subsequent chapter, here are five out of perhaps 5,000 brief illustrations of what made COP tick:

Item 1: Roberta Ellis of COP Minneapolis, in her mid-forties, a divorced mother, was a country club kitchen worker from 5 p.m. to 6 a.m., took care of six to seven children plus several of her own in her home during the day, and somehow found time to teach Sunday school. Determined to become a teacher, she entered the Minneapolis New Careers Program as a school aide and assumed a 19-21 credit quarterly load at the University of Minnesota. In August 1972, with 5 months of hospitalization from an automobile accident behind her, she graduated from the university and became a regular fifth-grade teacher. Shortly thereafter, Ms. Ellis enrolled as a candidate for a graduate degree, one of countless COP graduates who kept on learning long after their COP phase had ended.

Item 2: Of 25 COP Richmond trainees attending Contra Costa College in California in the 1972-73 school year, 16 made the Dean's List. Three more received additional academic honors. Preliminary data indicate that in the larger COP world, the COP trainee was a better student than his or her non-COP peers—all this, of course, while holding an aide's job and running a family.

Item 3: Mrs. Ruth Winney, a Navajo Indian in her fifties, began her formal education as a 7-year-old at a boarding school in Fort Defiance, Ariz., spent the rest of her childhood and early youth in schools away from home, and, with a high school diploma to her credit, became an assistant in a Bureau of Indian Affairs school. The job could lead nowhere, and the closest college was over 200 miles away. Then came the new Navajo Community College and COP, and Mrs. Winney was on her way.

Item 4: From the age of 9, Richard Gatica of Crystal City, Tex., spent at least half of every year as a migrant worker in the North. He left school after the eighth grade. In the Army, Gatica obtained high school equivalency documentation (GED) and, after discharge, held several jobs while earning 2 years of postsecondary credits. An outstanding student in his COP years at Southwest Texas Junior College in Uvalde and Texas A & I in Laredo, he graduated early and assumed a bilingual teaching post in 1972. In 1974, Gatica was selected to be director of the same COP program which had given him his professional start.

Item 5: In all of Alaska in 1969, the number of certified Eskimo and Indian teachers taken together was six. In the schools where the combined COP-Teacher Corps program functioned, 95 percent of the children were native, and, as recently as 1973, 99 percent of the teachers were non-native. Ninety percent of the COP-TC participants were native. Every new native teacher added to the system will be not only an important statistic but a long-needed boost for the native Alaskan population. As a result of COP-TC, the total could reach 75 in this very thinly populated region of the country.

In an era replete with inspirational tales of tardily discovered human potential unleashed, these were almost random selections. For every "ordinary" COP striver, there was a Dallas mother of eight who maintained a 4.0 grade average, or an Indian COP graduate appointed to a presidential advisory council, or a disabled Black Vietnam veteran giving hope to ghetto children in New Orleans. It was thoroughly predictable that such people, more even than their communities or institutions or COP staff, would give the COP sites their real character. And they were never in short supply.

The Director: Paul(a) Bunyan in Control

One of the verities of contemporary American education is that the administrative and psychological skills of the educational leader of the 1950s are insufficient for the 1970s. It is commonly accepted, for example, that the perception of the building principal as the school's manager and all-knowing instructional leader is obsolete. Today's principal or dean or superintendent, for that matter, must be more and less. The prevailing wisdom holds that the responsible steward of a public educational enterprise need be neither master teacher nor intellectual guru. Rather, today's leader must be an informed and credible link to the outside world, a sensitized mediator and political negotiator, and yet a thoroughly modern administrator capable of managing people and facilities in ways and in circumstances that were all but unthinkable as recently as the 1950s. In education today, the operations leader also has to be a manager by objectives, a systems theorist, an organizational developer, and, if the shoe fits, a participant in encounter groups.

In this context, in the late sixties, the COP directors made their first appearances, taking their social and cultural cues from neither the sedate fifties nor the more confusing seventies. The new COP leaders were cast in no preformed mold. If they were shaped by any single period in our recent past, the middle and later sixties might fill the bill. Whatever their ethnic, social, or educational antecedents, all had been touched by the great, often tragic, events of that period. All brought personal visions to their new work. And if their entering credentials were sometimes flawed (a few, of course, brought pluperfect portfolios), their greater purposiveness and readiness to capture COP's new idioms and techniques made many of this new breed ideal for the responsibilities ahead.

About 75 percent of the time, the COP project director was a product of the school system to which the new COP enterprise was to be affixed. Those who were not, like most of those who were, could claim identity with the community in which COP was to be situated, either as residents past or present, educators, or, in some instances, social, church, or community action workers. The bulk had earlier backgrounds in teaching, with about 75 percent claiming subsequent experience at administrative and managerial levels. At the time of their selection, most were tenured members of the school system's staff. Although the proportions fluctuated, close to two-thirds of the directors were male. Not all were technically full-time COP directors; the average assigned-time to COP was about 80 percent. A surprising percentage, perhaps as high as 80, had already earned advanced degrees, with over 10 percent holding doctorates. White directors administered some projects that were predominantly Black, Hispanic, or Native American in their participant or student composition, but these were exceptions and frequently short-term arrangements.

In March 1970, the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development/USOE published the COP *Project Director's Handbook*, a manual of official prescriptions and procedures for the newly selected COP projects. In this useful compendium, which ranges from societal rationales to administrative procedures, the role of the director is left largely to the reader's imagination. While the functions of a COP project are effectively detailed, there is no explicit mention, in all 71 pages, of the role to be played by the agent taking primary responsibility for the undertaking. The only mention of the qualifications and roles of the staff—let alone of the director—comes in a section which appears to collectivize the stewardship of a COP project rather than fix responsibility on the individual selected as director. The relevant paragraph (italics from the original) follows:

> *Staff for a Career Opportunities Project will require past experience in low-income areas either working, living, or participating there. The staff at all levels, both in the school and at the colleges, should reflect in ethnic background and experience those being served—both as Career Opportunities Program participants and as students in the school.* Staff members must be able to communicate well with diverse personalities including the school officials, teachers, children and youth involved in the project, the participants themselves, parents, and other citizens of the community who have contributions to make to the success of the project. The staff must possess personal qualities and abilities which will enable them to carry out the various elements required of a Career Opportunities Project, including planning the project in cooperation with other groups and institutions, recruiting participants for the project, conducting some of the training components, counseling the participants, encouraging wholesome school-community relationships, evaluating the effect of the project, and adjusting the project content to the needs of the school(s) being served.

The statement is at once dismaying and encouraging. In omitting the project's most important directing and unifying force, it does considerable disservice to the individuals destined, whther ready or not, to don the inadequately described mantle of project leadership. In the process, it echoes the vagueness that characterized one popular leadership style of the sixties: give power to the people and let them figure out how best to use it. At the same time, this lack of precision offered the new director an unanticipated opportunity to develop an unencumbered leadership style. Clearly, no one else was going to administer the $150,000-plus pot that came to the average COP project every year. Nor could the elaborate organizational linkages and arrangements expected of COP sites be developed by committees of otherwise-employed people; even when the college or university sought involvement beyond providing contracted services, the strictures on the "free" time of concerned faculty members relegated their COP interests to a background already crowded with uncorrected papers, faculty committees, and publishers' deadlines. That left the director.

Certain COP directors found this freedom indigestible. Released from their berths within the hierarchy of the school system, they became regulation-bound and apprehensive over their post-COP futures. Some were uneasy with college and community alike, and, worse yet, unresponsive to the world of participants often desperately in need of sustained counseling and reinforcement. For other COP Directors, the job was a winner. It offered unparalleled opportunities for a conscientious and ambitious person to render sorely needed services. In addition to carrying out the day-to-day functions of the post, the COP director was part of a national network of peers. There was advantageous access to the executive levels of school systems and nearby colleges and universities. It was a time to nurture and sharpen skills, to become part of a community's larger network of human services, to expand one's prior professional limits and, frequently, to acquire university faculty status. A directorship meant working closely with senior functionaries of the State department of education, and it involved one in the heady mix of power struggles and conflicting ideologies that characterized public educational policy at the Federal level over the life of the program.

To most of the directors of COP's 132 projects, the center ring was what Michael Harrington called the "other America," the places where poor Americans lived and worked. As often as not, the college came there, to the COP site, to offer the courses that the director had suggested and may, in fact, have designed. Here and there, the director also gave the course—or monitored it to determine its suitability. No self-respecting COP director could be long absent from the classroom; many made regular rounds and also met weekly with participants to take their collective pulse, proffer individual counseling, and analyse the need, if any, to develop projectwide remedial courses. Then there was the nonstop quest for resources. The creative COP director was either born with the skills of the master bandit or quickly developed them. The record of casual cooperative undertakings evolving into new or alternative resources for COP projects is too substantial to have been accidental.

But hard-core management capabilities, charismatic leadership, and manifold hand-holding qualities are only some of the characteristics required of the COP directors. Equally important and less easily depicted are the special dimensions the public has come to expect of its leaders. To be a successful molder of people and events, observers from Tug McGraw to W. Clement Stone have implied, "You gotta believe." The men and women who steered the COP machine all believed in providing a better educational break for the children of America's underclass and a second chance for their parents. Combined with this near-theological conviction, though, were other concerns covering a spectrum as wide as the 50 States. In most projects, the director's concerns directly reflected the preoccupations of the COP-served constituency: reactivating dormant cultural values, closing achievement gaps, relating the educational problems of the poor to those of the larger community, or, in a healthy number of cases, inculcating rigorous intellectual values in communities that had had all too little exposure to education as an effective path to individual and group identity and dignity.

There is no prototypical COP director. They came in all sizes, ages, shapes, and colors. A computer printout might make a statistical stab, but the proximate 37-year-old Black male, advanced degree-holding, former taxi driver and community activist who might emerge would probably be no more representative of the group than a 56-year-old, Puerto Rican, former principal or a 29-year-old, Appalachian sculptor with a doctorate in education. A good case study is Shirley A. Collier, the real life director of the Grand Rapids, Mich., project. An energetic, Black educator, Ms. Collier has been an elevator operator, salad "girl," punch press operator, and union activist. Her college education began at age 35 and has continued into doctoral studies at Michigan State University, with a master's degree along the way from Western Michigan University. Holder of an NDEA grant, by then an experienced teacher and program director, Ms. Collier assumed direction of the Grand Rapids COP project in 1970 and has made it an integral, highly visible feature of the city's educational scene. Shirley Collier is full of experience-based proverbs and maxims. Coming from her—and mirroring, as they do, the sentiments of the community of COP directors—they are neither banal nor precious. A few representative Collierisms:

> "Set long-range goals and work toward them."
>
> "Know yourself before you try to influence or judge others."
>
> "Think community rather than competition. Try to achieve your potential, but seek ways that other individuals can also use to achieve theirs."
>
> "Never try to put people into stereotypical boxes."
>
> "Help each individual to develop his potential to the point where he can find personal satisfaction in his own self, worth, and dignity as a human being, and has a sense of making a contribution to society."
>
> "Remember, a know-it-all never learns anything."

The COP Community at Work

A vignette that occurred in the *non-COP* world of Federal projects:

The Washington monitor of a project in a large southern city was being given the full, onsite, VIP treatment. "Never in my experience," said the helpful assistant superintendent for curriculum development (or training or Federal grants or allied causes), "have I seen anything to approach the kind of broad-based community support this project has animated." From inner-city school to university campus, the "Fed" trekked relentlessly in search of the elusive truth about the enterprise. It came on the second night in the dingy all-purpose room of a ghetto junior high school, where the project's 15-member community advisory board was to meet. Forty-five minutes after the appointed time, 10 of the members arrived together, ebullient and slightly flushed. The meeting began, and it was all downhill. The experienced Federal controller knew exactly what she was observing: a pro forma exercise in participatory governance by a jaded group of professional community folks who had been at it since the first community action programs of the mid-1960s. They neither cared particularly about the project being reviewed nor possessed more than a touch of information concerning it. Indeed, it later developed, they had convened for the first time in 8 months because, as one of them put it, "The director was under heat from the Feds, and we owed him a couple. So we went bowling, had a beer, caught a Title I meeting, and came on over."

This could have happened in the COP network, but it didn't. The gap between promise and performance in COP's communities was seldom wide. It couldn't be. Almost all of a COP project's action was at the "target site." The people, participants, and schoolchildren alike, were usually from the immediate neighborhood, or one nearly identical to it. The participant figure in 1971 was 96 percent from the community being served. The COP design itself, as developed by a parity group including representatives of all provinces of the future COP nation, was intended for indigenous consumption. Therefore, what was good for COP was good for the community. And vice versa. In fact, the two were indivisible, and an honest and thoughtful reciprocation was built in.

With these precepts in place, the Washington guideline drafters could be both prescriptive and relaxed: prescriptive in that all projects were to have a clear commitment to a vital lay role in COP affairs, and relaxed to the extent that there could be no doubt that significant home-grown involvement was inevitable. An April 1969 draft version of COP's guidelines modestly called for "means for involving the parents and others of the community in the project as appropriate." It suggested that "the use of existing community bodies might be made" and concluded a seven-line section with this observation: "At a minimum, provision should be made for full community understanding of the objectives and operation of the project, and for its response to them." Later official COP publications were only slightly more demanding. The draft *Program Information* pamphlet of June 1969 limited itself to a statement that a primary objective of COP was "to encourage greater understanding and participation between the community and the school."

If this was not a first-order priority before COP was launched, it moved to the forefront shortly thereafter as a result of USOE's decision to center EPDA programs on low-income clients and their neighborhoods; the new constituency's demands, voiced most strenuously at Denver in August 1969, for involvement in decisionmaking; and, far from least, the BEPD commitment to parity at all levels. By March 1970, the newly issued *Project Director's Handbook* was calling for a specific and at certain points even grandiose community role up and down the COP line (italics from the original):

> *The concept of a partnership between school (LEA), college, and community is to characterize the entire developmental process.* In addition, the State department of education will play a continuing role in project development. While the

> period for the development of the prospectus was short and, therefore may have made such collaboration difficult, the time available for the proposal development process offers ample opportunity for the required cooperative effort. *This process must begin promptly, continue throughout the entire development process, and the implementation stage of the program.*
>
> While one or another member of the partnership may have a more central role in one or another of the program's components, each has something to contribute to every stage of the program. Thus, each is to be involved in the entire planning and development process.
>
> *Career Opportunities should be viewed as a program encompassing the concept of planned social and institutional change.* A possible scheme is to bring together participants from each of the groups as a local Career Opportunities Program council. It is important that the participation on the council from any of the three groups not be too limited. For example, participants from the school should include not only staff from the superintendent's office, but also teachers, administrators, and present paraprofessionals, who will be involved in the program's implementation. Representatives from teacher and other staff organizations, as appropriate to the local situation, should be involved. Similarly, those involved from the training institutions should include the faculty members who will teach the paraprofessionals as well as the appropriate administrative officials. Among the sources of community participation might be an already existing community advisory board, a Model Cities board, as well as representatives of private groups or nonprofit citizen groups. The community representation should particularly take into account roles for parents and for students, as well as for community members who are key residents of the neighborhoods of the schools served by the Career Opportunities Program. Such a C.O.P. Council would continue through the life of the program as an ongoing mechanism for cooperation and involvement. In every site with a Model Cities program, the Model Cities board should be the vehicle for this partnership, or be a part of the C.O.P. Council.

Comparing COP councils is like comparing the governments of Japan and Mississippi. Common purpose is evident, but objectives, styles, and even accomplishments were inconsistent. As a rule with many exceptions, councils were constituted as USOE had decreed, but their lives were lived in two distinct phases. The first, perhaps the more important, was the phase of launching and activation of the project. Here, many of the councils were invested with make or break power. They could and did recruit and select participants, a role that saw them invading the school system's territory to judge which of a district's employees were to receive what amounted to free college educations and guaranteed professional futures. This was no small responsibility, and it was deeply resented by some school administrators unaccustomed to such interventions. The selection of the project director was on a similar plane. Statistics conflict, but consensus exists that between half and two-thirds of the community councils were important in the selection process. And even before these two important processes involving participants and directors, most councils were, in widely varying measures, involved in developing the original proposal, staging community orientation activities, drafting the project's operational codes, and otherwise busying themselves with the problems of conception and gestation. Lest the council picture appear rosier than it was, however, it is fair to note that some educational jurisdictions functioned as feudal baronies, the peasant chorus being played by the council membership. In these autonomous fiefdoms, community councils had as much impact on district policies and decisions as a peasant would be expected to exercise on those of his feudal lord. They were trotted out for ceremonial occasions and then quickly returned to their normal pursuits. For the record, the average COP project advisory group had 21 or 22 members, of whom four represented the school system, seven or eight were designated as community representatives, two or three were from the teacher training institutions, four or five were COP trainees, and the rest came from unions, Model Cities groups, or other locally significant bodies.

While the attitude of the Federal policymakers was relaxed—they were always ready, for example, to grant that the nucleus of COP community participation might be an existing body, as had been suggested in 1969—it was never casual. There was no letdown of interest or concern once the first phase was concluded. But at different locales, thoroughly diverse patterns emerged as councils, entering the second phase, fell into a pattern of infrequent meetings and greatly diminished interest. Some councils, especially those with representatives from funding sources such as Model Cities, continued to assert themselves with undiminished vigor. In Gary, Ind., a 50-member council heavily weighted with COP trainees effectively refused to acknowledge that community participation was a two-phase affair. Once the project took shape, the Gary council, like those in Oakland, Cleveland, and dozens of others, remained in the game, advising, mediating, conducting in-service workshops, and generally building communitywide support for COP. The 10 villages of the Alaska joint COP-Teacher Corps enterprise have ten different kinds of councils; with different tribal customs and structures, all identify themselves with the program.

While documentation on the COP-wide impact of representative lay participation is sketchy, a good guess at its impact could be facilitated by designing a spectrum running from token participation on one end through a series of internal gradations—embracing advice-giving; consultation before executive-level policymaking; action recommendations; official clearance preceding decisionmaking; and actual sharing in the making of policies and decisions, including explicit veto power—to complete community control on the other.

Whatever assessment method might ultimately be used, there remains not the slightest doubt that the program was pointed directly at indigenous poor people who, along with all other groups involved in their educational experience, were to have substantial influence in determining how the process would work. What matters is that some power came to the COP communities, that they exercised it responsibly, and that, in its unique way, COP contributed to the further development of the participatory political process in the United States.

In the Schools: Where COP Happened

The former superintendent of a large eastern city school system on COP:

> What I knew of COP I liked. Aides from the neighborhood are a good force for a school and probably for the kids. Many have teaching potential, and COP deserves credit for supporting this. And they don't give you much trouble because they like their work and see it leading to better jobs. I suppose it was a good idea to give us the money to get them trained, but I'm not sure how much worse it would have been if it had gone straight to the colleges. Probably about the same, given the way some of the colleges are beginning to come around. I understand USOE wanted COP to stimulate a lot of changes. They'll come, but COP is only one of a hundred ways to get school systems off the dime. Still, I'll never fault COP for getting more community people into the schools. That's made a real difference.

The principal of an open classroom school in West Virginia:

> Taken as front-line paraprofessionals, the COP aides are good. I'd like to be able to keep them as teachers. But I'm equally interested in holding aides, especially in the open classroom situation we have here, where small group work is essential. I'll fight for that. The thing that dazzles me is the extraordinary sacrifices they're making to get their college training. We're a small system, and these folks matter in it. No, I can't yet describe how or whether they've brought any specific changes around here. I understand the Federal government expected some. I'm sure that things are happening, but we'll have to feel rather than see or hear them.

Both officials displayed a practical awareness of the COP presence in the schools. They understood its limitations. Neither harbored illusions about COP as the main force for achieving sweeping school reform. From their vantage points, it showed strength and promise but not, perhaps, on a major scale. But from the point of view of the program planners in Washington—in terms of organizational dynamics—the school was the star to which the COP wagon was to be hitched. Even more than the college or community or even the individual paraprofessional, the school was the plinth of the COP structure. Get at the schools through training their staffs, the reasoning went, and big things are bound to happen, per these lines from an early USOE document on COP (italics in the original):

> *The Career Opportunities Program anticipates results that go beyond affecting a particular group of children. They extend to the structure and organization of the school and its relationships to other institutions.* Thus, it is to be expected that as a result of the Career Opportunities Program, schools may be improved in a number of ways. For example, changes such as the following may be anticipated:

> - New staffing patterns including both differentiated staff roles as well as career advancement programs.
> - New opportunities for the entire staff to engage in planning, training, and participation in the life of the school.
> - New forms of evaluation of performance in the classroom, as well as new ways of preparation and credentialing.
> - New and wholesome interaction between school and training institutions with much more of the work of the latter taking place in the former.
> - Participation of youngsters in the teaching process, as in Youth Tutoring Youth programs.
> - New patterns of teamwork within the school.
>
> These and other improvements are possible outcomes of a Career Opportunities Program. Their achievement will be a result of a premeditated and carefully delineated plan toward that end. Thus statements of changes sought, the reasons for designing them, and the strategies to be followed in achieving them, should be part of the proposal.
>
> Positive commitment of all relevant agencies based upon cooperative participation of the entire school leadership—school board, superintendent, principals, supervisors, teachers, and other staff—is an indispensable prerequisite to the success of the Career Opportunities Program.

These are grandiose expectations, especially as processes and outcomes to be brought about by COP alone. They are less awesome as the plausible yields of collaborations and interactions transcending the mid-range demonstration that COP represented. With one or two exceptions—the "change" concerning new forms of evaluation of classroom performance is a clear overstatement*, and the "new patterns of teamwork" are doubtless subsumable elsewhere—they represent goals that are achievable in the long run. Interestingly, other more ambitious contributions the schools are expected to make are only rarely spelled out in COP's official literature. A major one, treated in Washington as near-dogma, was COP's courageous espousal of the doctrine that the school, not the college of education, was the best judge of its own training needs.

With but 10 exceptions, local education agencies were the COP grantees. The administrative mandate and the money were transmitted directly to them, and with these came total stewardship of the COP enterprise. If the educational responsibility appeared staggering, the strictly managerial one was probably far less so. By the time COP arrived, the myriad Federal educational programs born into the last half of the sixties, particularly those whose wellspring was the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, had sensitized school administrators to the Federal universe. Most systems of respectable size—a population of 100,000 was the usual minimum—had designated assistant superintendents or directors for Federal programs. It was through their offices that COP's administrative channels usually ran, and the individual finally chosen as COP director was customarily already known to the Federal programs director. Within smaller systems, these were sometimes the same person. Nothing that Washington said or did could faze them. They had lived far too long with the problems of their own systems to be overwhelmed by those of another, which usually couldn't even afford to send its agents out to check up.

---

*The COP national office did support the development of a new instrument for assessing classroom interaction, ACE and then BRACE, prepared by Garda Bowman and Rochelle Silbert Mayer at Bank Street College of Education.

With their funding proposals checked off in Washington and the money flow beginning, what did COP's school systems want from the new program? All, it can be fairly stated, foresaw benefits to their institutions, to the individuals involved in the new processes, and to the children in the COP classrooms. All had signed on for the COP duration, and their commitments were sincere. But these commitments took different forms in different settings. While fully accepting the COP purpose, as well as its operational modes, the school systems that had become involved in the COP experience were less than unanimous in their view of its ultimate meaning.

At the lower end of the scale, there were probably a few school superintendents in the COP empire whose sense of the potential of the Federal discretionary program was measured more sharply in dollars and cents than in learning or social gains to the community they served. Beginning to sniff local financial retrenchment a year or two away, they were prepared to promise a slice of the moon in exchange for good, hard U.S. dollars. They would run a COP project, mostly by the book, and it might actually be a good one. It might even unearth some truths about preparing leaders and paraprofessionals. But, above all, it would create jobs while relieving pressure to hire teachers. It could demonstrate cost consciousness to overseeing school boards and politicians, and it could enhance one's image as a crafty tiger in the grants jungle. And if a smart superintendent did it carefully, he could use COP funds to underwrite all kinds of inservice training. This wasn't even a challenge for a good old school pro.

At many points along the COP chain, the temptation to exploit the aides was irresistible. This was not an unusual circumstance in American public education, which has never displayed consistency in its treatment of aides. It could be assumed that administrators would have few qualms about using paraprofessionals in whatever fashion they deemed most useful to the school system. At one end of the spectrum, the mature, all-but-licensed aide with a year or so to full certification could be slipped into a classroom as a regular teacher, and few would be the wiser. At the other end, a less experienced participant would probably not be too upset over a few months or so of clerical duties, hall monitoring, or helping out in the supply room. In neither situation was the trainee performing duties that she or he was hired to do. When this happened, COP became a humanpower program, and its basic purposes were subverted. One of those purposes, to reiterate a basic COP dictum, was that COP aides be immediately involved in the work of the classroom.

To more than a few administrators, COP was divine deliverance from the overwhelming problems of the new kinds of children in their schools. White, suburban, and middle class like the majority of the teachers in their schools, many of these superintendents and principals found themselves poorly equipped to deal constructively with the many problems—emotional, learning, disciplinary, and often physical—of the children of low-income backgrounds who now populated the former white working-class districts served by COP's 2,936 schools. Competent and motivated though they were, these school people frequently could not establish constructive contact with children who arrived at school hungry, ill-clothed, and speaking in a foreign language, or an all but incomprehensible version of English. But COP's aides could usually reach them, naturally and with good success. And this by itself was sufficient reason for countless school people to embrace COP and hope it would never go away. That COP's promise transcended this function was immaterial to many of these single-task oriented managers; enough that COP did one important thing well.

The majority of the COP school systems properly regarded the program as a superb link to their communities, and not merely because COP's individuals related especially well to children. At its core, the COP group invariably had in it some of the neighborhood's most responsible people, individuals a witting school administrator needed to have identified with the schools. These were usually the people and groups who fought the good fights and whose standards were those of the best of the community. In the back of a sage school person's mind, too, was the sense that, while COP participation was not exactly co-optation, it surely represented a harnessing of some of these talents and energies in ways that would serve the urgent demands of the schools rather than neutral or even counterproductive ends (from the point of view of the school's function). The potential cost was high in terms of surrendered authority, but most capable school people had long since learned when and how far to bend. Some systems, including those of several of the largest cities in the country, were less flexible in exploiting COP to help them adjust to their communities. In failing to mine the COP lode, they foresook superlative opportunities to strengthen themselves and to bank assets against an uncertain future.

Many involved educators thought COP provided a unique opportunity for getting into the realm of "instructional management" and the new methods and technologies of modern teaching. It took an especially enlightened and informed administration to understand how paraprofessionals could influence the actual processes of schooling, but many were willing to learn. To them, COP's strengths as a source of money, staff, and community outreach were secondary. It was what could be done in the classroom that was the real measure of the COP presence. In these systems, COP became the vanguard of innovation in learning. The COP aide was the adult in individualized instructional settings, the point person in bilingual and bicultural activity, the main two-way communicator on behavioral matters, and the principal subject of a school's first tentative probes into differentiated staffing patterns.

Finally, COP was an appropriate vehicle for building within a system the career ladders and lattices that the growing paraprofessional movement, abetted by teachers' unions, was increasingly demanding. The typical middle- to large-sized urban school system was, by 1970, employing several different categories of assistants, auxiliaries, teachers' helpers, and others subsumable under the label "education paraprofessional." There was little order or purpose to these groupings, and school systems were often unable to give them coherence. The COP stipulation that grantee systems develop appropriate vertical and lateral arrangements for aides was thus both timely and welcome. The technical personnel job was done by COP for the system, without cost or sacrifice of talent, and the far loftier purposes of ladders and lattices were respected, frequently to the reflected credit of a superintendent for whom the whole business had previously been a painful headache. And the completed task had more than a touch of professionalism to it, for COP projects, and therefore the schools, were able to call on the program's nationally recognized source of developmental and technical assistance, the New Careers Training Laboratory, and on the rapidly accumulating body of experience being gained throughout COP.

In their various forms and combinations, the above probably encompass most of a school system's rationales for embracing COP. Another reason, which appears to have mattered more to Washington than to the school districts served by COP, is the precedent-setting arrangement by which colleges and universities in effect became employees of school systems. As described earlier, the Federal money went directly to the school systems, which assessed the higher educational needs of the aides, shopped for appropriate and willing institutions to provide the training and, in effect, made subgrantees of colleges and universities which had probably never imagined such a thing happening on the scale of a COP project. Virtually all had experienced diverse inservice training connections with nearby public education authorities, but providing whole new ranges of services for 30 or 75 or even 200 low-income dropouts or "never been theres"—and furnishing them to the specifications of an inner-city or Indian reservation school system—was a groundbreaking undertaking.

The school districts, generally through their newly appointed COP directors, addressed the task with a gamut of attitudes. On the whole, they welcomed the evident reversal of roles, in which gown became servant to town and the cares of a community's schools appeared for the first time to matter more than the affairs of academe. More importantly, they relished the challenge of combining forces with local postsecondary institutions to get at core problems of training future teachers drawn from the least prosperous sectors of the community. But this attitude was not always shared by all. As for the colleges, some were delighted with the new collaborations, but a few could hardly have been less interested. The largest number, without feeling that they were compromising their reputations or futures, seemed willing to try to tailor responsive programs.

Relations between the school and the academic institutions were usually carried out in an open and matter-of-fact way. At times, though, relations became abrasive, as the schools levied stiff demands on their academic partners or the colleges proved to be less flexible than they had promised to be. Too, some COP directors who were otherwise superbly qualified for their jobs had never dealt with the universities on any but a student/professor basis. Initially, at least, they were ill-prepared to design whole educational programs or to meet these higher education colleagues on an equal footing. The large majority, however, took the task in stride and performed it more than adequately.

COP and Higher Education: The College as Public Servant

It is an understatement to say that the higher education establishment was oblivious to COP. Poll the national higher education associations at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., for example, and their responses could give COP an inferiority complex. Of these approximately 25 bodies, representing most of the Nation's colleges and universities, it is improbable that more than six or eight would acknowledge more than minimal awareness of this mid-range Federal teacher training program. Yet COP was connected to the teacher training segments of as much as 10 percent of the membership of these organizations.

The blame, if that is what it is, can be laid at the door of COP's architects. In their minds, while the 270-odd cooperating colleges and universities occupied a large niche in the COP scheme of things, these institutions were nevertheless not at the exact center of COP's target. Rather, they were a vitally important "supporting service." Little was initially expected of them beyond their readiness to assist projects in finding what USOE's guideline-drafters called "better ways of training personnel for schools through a work-study approach." Throughout COP's manuals, handbooks, announcements, and guidelines of the 1969-70 period, there are only infrequent, rather neutral references to the program's higher education segment. In the COP setting, the university appeared at first to be a semi-outsider, not really of the place and time, but providing a necessary contribution as required. A few isolated teacher training institutions actually administered COP grants themselves, but the circumstances were unique and the practice was exceptional.

If this is harsh, it is intended to be. For in the late 1960s COP epitomized the angry dissatisfaction of many Federal administrators with the reluctance of teacher training institutions—the legatees of a century of fixed-curriculum normal schools—to modernize their product for a new market. It was no difficult task to find Federal-level educators and administrators who subscribed to the proposition that the time to stimulate change had come—or possibly passed. One obvious weapon, the EPDA dollar, was at hand, and COP represented a near-perfect finger on the trigger. Combine resources, desire, and a guiding philosophy, and the results were predictable. The more imaginative university representatives were ready with creative accommodations to COP's imperatives. A few wanted nothing to do with the whole business. Most of those who finally signed on found themselves, reluctantly, then almost willingly, drawn into new approaches to old jobs and new outlooks on their own professional purpose and image.

Once caught in the COP vortex, the cooperating teacher training institution found itself dealing with old clients on different bases. The institution's task, pure and simple, was to make certified, degree-holding teachers of persons perceptibly different from those who had traditionally proceeded relatively unobstructed from high school to college. But the task was inhibited, or at least complicated, by a myriad of new or mainly unfamiliar problems:

- the admission of COP participants who not only had not completed high school, but had not yet met GED criteria;
- the granting of credit for undocumented "life experience," military service, or on-the-job training, a difficult adjustment for any postsecondary institution;
- the special needs of a body of street-wise, vocationally oriented, new students, 10 and more years older than their student peers, and publicly unwilling to submit to the "small-mindedness" of the teacher education world;
- the relocation of teaching responsibilities from the academy to onsite, off-hour settings convenient to the COP trainees but far less so to faculty members;
- the dropping of traditional student teaching requirements in favor of appropriate credit for supervised paraprofessional work—an exceptionally tough proposal which appeared to strike at the heart of an education college's professionalism;
- the development of an interdisciplinary "core" course, called something like "The Sociology of the Inner City" or "The Ecology of the Classroom," which, in the words of an early COP document, "attempts to make both teachers and aides aware of the inter-

action of culture, life experience, and problems of poverty on the public school classroom";

- the creation of new courses, or the enrichment of regular ones, "to provide auxiliaries with the special skills they need to offer local students an education which improves upon that offered before COP arrived"; and
- the provision of "counseling and certain sheltered courses" to allow COP participants gradual adjustment to the academic demands of the college.

These represent only the vertebrate structure of a teacher training institution's COP responsibilities. To them must be added an unorganized package of relationships, human and organizational, probably unlike any in the institution's history. A worthy institution, would, for example, try to work at the State level on the special problems of licensing and supporting career mobility for paraprofessionals or on the gut issue of recognizing performance-based criteria in the licensing of teachers. It would become intimately involved in the governance of the project through enlightened participation, often encountering in the process spirited opposition from community representatives on the advisory council. Even more important to the institution itself, it would analyze its experience with COP to determine whether and how much structural and theoretical adjustment should be made throughout a department, school, or college of education. Any self-respecting college of education would surely also feel compelled to share its COP experience beyond its own confines. Relations with the 2-year college were no longer centered on the *pro forma* acceptance or rejection of course credits; in the new COP world, fairness to the participants dictated broadly based linkages covering their whole, integrated academic exposure.

It took an unusually effective and sensitive person to coordinate all of the actions and forces bearing on a project's higher educational functions. Mostly, college coordinators for COP projects were already affiliated with their COP university base. Some were brilliantly innovative academic managers. Some were hacks, conveniently berthed in a federally supported slot away from the college's main travelled roads. Still others defied easy grouping; these were the Black or Chicano or Indian education activists brought in both to bridge the COP/university gap and to cast an aura of enlightened involvement over institutions that needed shoring up in the area of affirmative action. The average coordinator devoted 35 percent of his/her time to COP, the same to non-COP administrative tasks, and 20 percent to teaching. Almost half (47 percent) enjoyed tenure, while 20 percent were tenured for the duration of the COP project. The school district had selected slightly more than one-third (not including the few college-based COP projects requiring coordinators in the school systems), but a large majority—64 percent—was picked up by the university itself. The latter figure is of interest in illustrating that a project director often had to work with COP staff people picked outside the school system. And the director probably couldn't fire them, either.

For many institutions, the COP tie was regenerative. It summoned talents and energies that had rarely been devoted so urgently and directly to problems of a real world peopled by poor and minority children and teacher aides. The spillover into the institutions' "normal" activities was enormous and, as will be discussed in Chapter VII, held singular meaning for the future. But that future hinged not only on a willingness to learn and change but equally on a reckoning of who these institutions were—or thought they were—in the first place.

By most recognized criteria, the majority of the teacher training schools which were touched by COP are not found in the top ranks of American higher education. There are no Harvards or Stanfords, no Smiths or Amhersts or Dukes. The occasional, large State university such as Minnesota, Massachusetts, Arkansas, Florida, Nebraska, or Washington is balanced by the considerably less well-known likes of Mars Hill, Barry, Avila, Lewis-Clark Normal, or Mount Saint Vincent. How to reckon where the COP trainee benefited most? Was more to be gained from the University of Alabama in Birmingham or from its older, more established sibling, the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa? Would the District of Columbia participant who came through D.C. Teachers and Federal City College have reaped larger benefits from matriculation at the better-known George Washington or Catholic Universities? What about such well-regarded private institutions as Mills, Boston University, or the University of Southern California? Did they give anything special to the program, the projects, or the participants?

There may never be valid criteria against which to frame replies. Institutional lethargy may prevail at Princeton and be nonexistent at vibrant Hartley Normal. The capacity for reform and self-improvement could be limitless at Dartmouth but nonexistent at incredible Credibility Tech. There are no rules of thumb and certainly very few answers. One college might locate all course work at the site, but, like the polyglot diplomat who utters no sense in any of his seven fully mastered languages, the courses offered could be abysmally dreary and uninspiring without exception. Another COP institution, otherwise unyieldingly conservative in its formal aspects, could offer its COP trainees a jewel of a core course and an unmatchable practicum. And so forth.

To record a penultimate thought about COP's higher education world (the ultimate thoughts are in Chapter VII, which is devoted solely to the subject) the whole area is COP's sleeper. Expectations were low. The college was not meant to be the engine in the COP machine. It was to be less. But things may not have worked out that way. The evidence merits closer examination. For a very great deal happened at many COP colleges and universities from 1970 to 1975, and there is good reason to suspect that one of COP's main contributions to American education will be found at places like Gannon and Pikeville, and others that are described later. That contribution may, in fact, cover an enormous array of attitudes, educational practices, social values, and even structural changes. In the jargon of the time, limited, planned interventions may have yielded unanticipated outcomes.

The Whole Product

Sociologists, psychologists, and political scientists will one day dissect the amorphous entity known as the Federal education project. Such an analysis, if objectively pursued, may well unearth hidden truths about organizations and about human behavior in and among them. And it may reveal quantifiable forces and stresses that determine their success or failure. For the lives of federally sponsored human service projects, whether COP or others, are phenomena of the times on the basis of which we may some day derive conclusions of major significance.

In its stripped-down form, a COP project is a functioning meld of the five components—participant, director, school system, community, and college or university—described earlier. To two of the five, the participant and the director, taking part in COP is a full-time, full-immersion undertaking. (Although a few directors managed to maintain limited involvement in other, non-COP enterprises, moonlighting was rare.) The COP commitments of the remaining three components could be characterized as generally energetic and purposeful, though not central in the panoply of their social and organizational concerns. To the schools and communities, COP represented a small fraction of a large, generally beneficient intrusion of the Federal government in their affairs. The higher education component eventually adjusted to COP, but it hardly dominated the life of any of the 270-odd institutions affected.

The dynamics of COP projects then, were not entirely predictable. Interactions among the main components, and among components arising from local characteristics, were affected by local conditions as well as the explicit terms of the Federal grant. They were also affected by a variety of significant interpretive divergences, amounting to spontaneous interventions, with respect to essential concepts: views of how to achieve the common purposes, perceptions of variations in roles, administrative practices, the use of COP projects for only indirectly COP-related ends, etc. Some inhibited, but few vitiated, the development of unified and coherent project structures. While most projects achieved harmony in their day-to-day affairs, others fell far short of that goal. There were COP projects that fed on conflict. And there were those to whom conflict was both abhorrent and destructive. An excessively energetic, interfering community could alienate an already beleaguered superintendent to the detriment of the whole COP and paraprofessional presence in a large school system, or its zeal could tip the balance in crucially positive ways. No two COP sites, whether in success or failure, no matter how close their physical resemblance, functioned in the same way.

In its lifetime, the ideal COP project should have conveyed a picture of vibrant, creative energies intelligently (and cost-effectively) aimed at chronic educational and societal problems. But bringing this off in a tangled web of Federal and local regulations and practices, conflicting demands, and cross-purposes was no easy task. The day-to-day course of a project was, after all, set by only one person, the director, and the advice of the "executive board," the advisory council, was seldom binding. Its counsel was often useful, but once given, was often not available again for weeks or months thereafter. Internal accountability, between the director and council, was often absent, with the natural result that the strong director could go his/her own way, while the more dependent (or democratic or responsible, depending on one's view of leadership) project chief was deprived of needed moorings.

How, then, to have a successful COP project? What were the bedrock qualities and imperatives that would contribute the most? Here are the fundamental ones:

1. *A strong, collective view of the project's purpose.* This would provide all concerned with a kind of unshakeable ideological security able to weather all pressures. The purpose, transcending the basics of aides and children, should be rooted in the educational and social issues of the community and the school system. If a jurisdiction's main problems were, for example, those of bilingual education or Black consciousness or improved school-community ties, these should be reflected in the project's larger profile.

2. *Broadly based popular and institutional support.* Armed with solid mandates from all five basic project elements, a director could deal from strength in promoting a project's objectives. The process would demand finely tuned political antennae, expertise in human and organizational relations, and a sense for the uses and misuses of power. Combined with a painstakingly built support base, however, such a project could be unstoppable.

3. *Projectwide agreement on the importance of teacher aides.* The main target of COP's efforts, the paraprofessional, was too often lost in the flow of other educational currents in some COP projects. Without projectwide consensus on the centrality of the teacher aide, a project could become just another Federal program. The project that kept a school system involved in the training and utilization of indigenous paraprofessionals—and viewed them as

vital forces in the system's efforts at self-improvement—was both meeting its responsibility and keeping everyone else honest. Those that did not were using COP for purposes fundamentally unrelated to their mission.

4. *The capacity to do the job.* Easily overlooked in examining the complex world of the COP site is the *sine qua non* of professional competence. Notwithstanding the importance of political ability, human relations skills, and ideological content, the criterion of applied ability was indispensable. The project had to be able to "hack it," across the board, that is. All of its people and institutions had to work at or near peak abilities most of the time. And the tasks included some of the least elevating work that "change agents" could imagine doing: filling endless forms, interminable negotiations over placement of aides, maintaining individual records, monitoring individual performance, designing courses and work experiences, responding to inconsistent demands from higher authorities, writing proposals, and myriad others.

This latter "imperative" was really where COP projects lived. Uninspiring and often downright dull, administrative chores had to be done—and done well—even in a temporary organization whose members knew the project's exact date of expiration. Some performed these chores badly, considering them "Mickey Mouse lay-ons" put into the COP mix by paper-pushers insensitive to COP's real problems and purposes. They weren't, of course; many were the products of Federal, State, or local legislation; and binding regulations; all were nothing less than the administrative conditions to which all of COP's projects had agreed when their proposals for funding reached Washington in late 1969.

To recount the odyssey of a typical COP site would be to repeat much of what has been described in other contexts and to anticipate the 10 project slice of COP life that fills the next two chapters.

Chapter 5. The City as COP Turf

David Walker, a free Black living in Boston, wrote in 1829:

> I pray that the Lord may undeceive my ignorant brethren, and permit them to throw away pretensions, and seek after the substance of learning. I would crawl on my hands and knees, through mud and mire, to the feet of a learned man, where I would sit and humbly supplicate him to instill into me that which neither devils nor tyrants could remove, only with my life—for colored people to acquire learning in this country, makes tyrants quake and tremble on their sandy foundation.

Almost a century and a half later, these words, part of *Walker's Appeal*, a fiery exhortation to the slave South, could have been those of the thousands of low-income, minority people—whether Hispanic, Native American, Black, or white—who came into the public schools to learn, to teach, and, in the case of the COP contingent, to learn to teach.

In a more ordered complex of public school systems than the United States yet enjoys, the weighting of COP participation between city and country might have been different. It could be argued that if West Virginia's rural project could support 90 COP aides for a population of 125,000, Baltimore should have had 500, Philadelphia 2,000, and New York as many as 5,000. It didn't happen that way, though, for several reasons. Systems generally accepted the numbers they could use successfully. Many nonurban areas had long considered themselves shortchanged in antipoverty programs, an oft-repeated charge to which Federal policymakers remained acutely sensitive, and most felt that COP was no exception. Urban systems were often already involved in teacher aide programs funded by ESEA Title I or other sources. And it would doubtless have proved uneconomical to start rural projects without a respectably sized participant group. Too, urban projects were heavily concentrated in small but inordinately needy Model Cities neighborhoods. The schools there couldn't have dealt with massive numbers of new aides; but they could use some.

Ethnicity, with its attendant implications, was a dominant theme in COP's early days in the city. If COP represented a delayed response to the needs so explosively manifested in the 1950s and 1960s, the delay did not imply the disappearance of the problems, but belated recognition of certain facets of them. One such facet in the cities of the 1960s and 1970s was the need to build and train school staffs that could intelligently approach the searing questions of an angry Black consciousness which the murder of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., had so dramatically spotlighted the year before COP happened. What better process and what better prospects than COP and the public it served? And where else but in the city?

The urban COP sites would doubtless resist facile overall classification, and, to be sure, no two were identical. Most, though, shared some readily definable characteristics, like these:

- As a presence in inner city schools, paraprofessionals had become an accepted feature of the educational landscape. They had been there for at least 5 years before COP arrived in all but a handful of urban systems. This was not the case in most rural school systems.
- What was different about the aides at COP sites was that they were explicitly not to be assigned to menial and/or dead-end jobs and were headed for better things. The career ladder/lattice idea was meant to be implemented, and usually was.
- With relatively few geographical problems in the city, there was less need for site-based college instruction than in the countryside. Where it did happen, most agreed that it was a splendid idea.
- Aides in city schools usually had less latitude than those in smaller, nonurban schools. Unless a COP participant or director complained very early on, a COP aide could quickly find herself or himself consigned to the noninstructional work that most school systems had traditionally reserved for paraprofessionals. Actual classroom teaching came much earlier in the COP process in the countryside schools.
- Advisory councils were understandably prone to talk governance and political power rather than hardcore educational subjects. Most were closely tied to Model Cities neighborhoods, sometimes with almost identical memberships, where issues of political power and self-determination were obsessive. Those that did direct themselves to learning and curricular issues found the experience rewarding.
- Teacher unions were involved in urban COP matters, to the considerable satisfaction of the participants, who felt themselves protected in the bureaucratic jungle and found union backing of career lattice arrangements to be a powerful weapon in their arsenal. At a meeting of 15 participants in a rural COP project, on the other hand, all but two said that they strongly opposed any union role in COP.
- Most graduates of COP projects were quickly employed as licensed teachers, even in the face of alleged teacher surpluses. Those who

were not could usually depend on substitute jobs or continuation as aides.

- The teacher training institutions in the cities were, as a rule, already involved in COP-style processes and were not as deeply affected by COP as the institutions where COP was the only program of its type. In some cases, however, the COP experience of the downtown universities and colleges was the decisive factor in causing them to re-evaluate their programs for preparing teachers.

* * *

New York, N.Y.

Among COP's 132 locales, New York City alone requires little or no scene-setting description. its huge size had much to do with COP's style and operational mode. With more of everything- especially people—more Blacks than nine different African countries, more Puerto Ricans than San Juan, and 125 COP-staffed schools—New York's COP conglomerate was also the Nation's largest. It received nearly 10 percent of COP's national budget to support the professional aspirations of its 800 trainees. Even the 800, however, were small potatoes next to the 4,000 non-COP auxiliaries the city's massive, decentralized school system has supported in their quest for better credentials, and the thousands more, perhaps as many as 8,000, who are not involved in higher education programs. If the four rural COP projects described in the next chapter were treated as one, the number of *regular teachers*, let alone paraprofessionals, would total less than 4,000.

By national COP standards, New York was Big Daddy, but to New York, COP was just one of dozens of Federal, State, city, church, and foundation projects, probably somewhere in the middle of the list financially ($10 million in 5 years is still a pretty substantial outlay, even for New York) but largely unknown because of its location in three particular Model Cities areas rather than throughout the city's 32 school districts.

School aides were hardly new to New York City when COP materialized in 1970, nor was a program to upgrade their qualifications to full professional teaching status an especially revolutionary idea. A modest program had been in existence since 1957, and a decade later a centralized Auxiliary Educational Career Unit (AECU) was created to act for the system in all matters concerning auxiliary school persons. By 1968, a project to underwrite tuition costs for 1,000 kindergarten aides to study for the associate of arts in teacher education had been successfully undertaken. It was a short step to a citywide effort to upgrade the credentials of 4,000 more auxiliaries (the system's all-embracing term for all categories of subprofessional, classroom personnel) by supporting expenses for up to 18 college credits per year in tracks agreed to by all concerned, including their union representatives.

With this wealth of auxiliaries already in place, why COP? As described by Director Gladstone Atwell, who also headed the AECU, there were several reasons why:

- COP paid for 30 credit hours of instruction per year as opposed to the 18 which the city system provided, thereby producing qualified teachers in 4 rather than 6 or 7 years.
- The COP group(s) shared a spirit and unity of purpose missing from the rest of the AECU world.
- COP participants received 5 hours weekly for released time, unlike auxiliaries in other programs, who received 1 to 2½ hours.
- The classroom experience of the COP aides was substituted for the normal student-teaching requirement.
- Most important, COP represented a tested system with a potentially sizable impact on how New York City would treat and train its paraprofessionals and its regular classroom teachers.

The administrative mechanics of COP New York were monumental. Its 800 participants were divided among the Model City districts of the South Bronx, Harlem-East Harlem, and central Brooklyn, resulting in a scattered identity for the city's COP endeavor. Dr. Atwell coordinated all three elements and was the director of the Harlem and Brooklyn areas. The Bronx component, with its own director, exercised most of the control of its 34 percent of the project budget, while Atwell directly administered the remaining 66 percent (21 to Harlem and 45 to Brooklyn). Participant identification tended to develop on a district basis rather than an entity called COP New York. Except when Dr. Atwell intervened, there was no contact or hint of it among the three. Through their separate COP Councils, the three subprojects made their own recommendations for funding, placement of the aides within schools and classrooms, and choice of teacher training institutions.

For reasons which are understandable in New York City, but make little sense beyond its borders, the City University of New York declined to act as the main teacher training institution, although two of its establishments—Lehman and Bronx Community College—eventually participated. Among other things, CUNY was already overcommitted, wouldn't substantially alter admission standards (which it finally did 3 years later), needed more than COP could pay for tuition and administrative expenses, and anticipated great difficulty in creating and obtaining approval of new courses. When this vast university with its campuses throughout the city declined to build a systemwide package, it became apparent that a creative approach was required. When the dust had settled, the Board of Education had subcontracted with Fordham University-Rose Hill, College of Mount St. Vincent, Lehman College, and Bronx Community College, as per the recommendation of the Bronx COP Council. Harlem-East Harlem recommended Marymount-Manhattan College and Fordham University at Lincoln Center. Brooklyn recommended the University of Massachusetts. Again, each college was subcontracted for by the Board of Education, City of New York.

Politics and management, the oil and water blend that sometimes produces effective governance in low-income programs such as COP, were on the front line of COP New York's concerns from the beginning. The situation in Harlem, which could have subdivided the subproject into Black and Puerto Rican segments, was not atypical. After a number of stormy sessions, a biracial advisory council was formed and, while it did not live entirely happily thereafter, it did bridge gulfs and give credible advice. A kind of third party in the project's governance was the United Federation of Teachers, which was selected in 1970 by the city's instructional paraprofessionals, including those in COP, to represent them. Once the Board of Education developed a career lattice (as stratified as any in the country), the union's role in protecting its integrity and the interests of its members who were moving through it became substantial and constructive. In a rare departure from long-cherished priorities, the UFT even downgraded seniority as a top criterion for selection of participants.

Despite its problems of scale, the New York COP project seemed to share many of the qualities, positive and negative, of its much smaller associates around the country. It provided opportunities where few or none had previously existed. It unearthed hidden human potential and matched it to compatible endeavors. It promoted acceptance of the notions and practices of new careers in the human services.

It is less easy to get an accurate reading on whether there can ever be a measureable impact at the various points and institutions along the COP New York network. The facts are that:

- Many of the city's own paraprofessionals were indistinguishable from those in COP (who had a slightly better deal).
- COP aides sometimes found themselves monitoring halls or performing clerical work for unconscionably long periods of time.
- Permanent, full-time employment in secondary schools in New York City is out of the question without a postgraduate degree.
- Elementary teachers must have the M.A. within 5 years.
- The teacher trainers, with the notable exceptions of the University of Massachusetts and the two Catholic women's colleges, appear to have made only limited adjustments to accommodate the COP trainees.

The fact that these conditions persist should not stand as a reproach to the project. They are simply conditions that have significantly affected it.

But the proof is in the participants, and the New York enterprise fared well in this respect. Entry into the program was highly competitive, although all applicants had to come from within the system, live in a Model Cities neighborhood, meet strict poverty criteria, and possess a high school diploma or its equivalent. Once past these qualifying hurdles, they were screened by college representatives, Model Cities committees, and the powerful local COP Council. At any given moment, on the average, the project's racial profile was 60 percent Black, 35 percent Spanish-American (overwhelminly Puerto Rican from East Harlem), and 5 percent white. Except for 227 veterans who passed through the project, all but a tiny fraction of the participants were women, roughly 600 of them. Dropouts ran about 20 percent, which bears highly favorable comparison with the national collegiate figure of 40 percent. For the Vietnam-era veterans, the program was economically as well as professionally advantageous. All received tuition, stipends, and G.I. Bill benefits, and 35 were financially assisted in graduate studies leading to degrees at the Bank Street College of Education.

Cedar Rapids, Ia.

Comfortably situated within the 4,370-square-mile, 370,000-inhabitant jurisdiction of COP Cedar Rapids is Iowa City, the home of the University of Iowa, a Big Ten institution with large, well-rounded facilities in all areas and a reputation for campuswide excellence. At the project's urban heart in Cedar Rapids is Coe College, a private, liberal arts college usually considered an exemplar of the merits of small scale in higher education. But no COP Cedar Rapids graduates will have passed through either the University of Iowa or Coe. Instead, COP's degrees were from Mount Mercy College, which evolved only recently from a 2-year Catholic women's school to a 4-year co-educational institution. And Mount Mercy, which provided COP instruction exclusively at the junior and senior levels—obviously not its traditional strength—agreed only reluctantly to serve the Cedar Rapids COP operation.

This is not the full story of COP Cedar Rapids, but it is characteristic of the kinds of opposition the project, like so many others, encountered in its efforts to get some worthwhile things done. A few more examples:

- Heavy burdens of time and economics were imposed by the lack or rare availability of public transportation in the project's seven-county area (Linn, Benton, Cedar, Iowa, Johnson, Jones, and Washington), a condition that saw participants traveling 500 miles a week with only insignificant reimbursement.

- The project was dispersed among 70 schools, a neat trick in an enterprise that averaged 80 aides at a given time.
- A chronic shortage of funds forced the COP administration to scrounge for dollar support, which was finally provided by ESEA Title I, the Joint County School System (an arrangement which involved four of the COP's seven counties and was linked to the other three), Head Start, and the USOE COP office (35 percent of participant salaries the first year and 15 percent the second, with the schools responsible thereafter).
- Many of the schools which had never employed aides were initially reluctant to participate in a program which brought new adults into their classrooms.
- The advisory council, which was ultimately constituted from a somewhat limited grouping of school, college, and participant representatives, bore witness, in effect, to the difficulties of assembling a more genuinely representative body to support, represent, and counsel the sproject.
- The State department of public instructions provided only uneven support; it finally approved a COP-created career lattice, but with the stipulation that it be tried as a pilot project on COP aides only.

While it could be said that roadblocks like these only strengthen the resolve of participants and staff to make a go of their joint endeavor, this was only partly true of COP Cedar Rapids, which changed directors twice in its first 3 years. By 1974, however, Dr. Larry Rickey, a former Coe College chaplain and professor, had gathered a small staff of two coordinators and a counselor, all with teaching and counseling backgrounds, and finally began to pull the pieces together.

Repeatedly, the experience of COP projects illustrated that the determination and ability of the participants themselves provided the prime catalyst for project viability. The theme cannot be overworked; new variations are forever emerging. The bedrock fact is, though, that COP represented the trainees' best hope to become part of a world beyond their immediate neighborhoods. Even when the COP aides were unable to run the full course, something new and better seemed to happen to them. Although 70 of the 189 who were enrolled in the Cedar Rapids project did not remain in it, many of these technical dropouts moved into non-COP schools, different roles, or better jobs. By their own accounts, they had been permanently and positively touched by COP. On the other hand, those who stayed with COP performed like their peers around the country: making honor rolls, showing unusual teaching gifts, reaching the children in ways difficult for many regular teachers, changing the attitudes of schoolteachers and college professors about the potential of mature, low-income people, and demonstrating how teacher aides can and should function. By the project's end in mid-1975, 42 expected to have their B.A.s from Mount Mercy and 67 more were to have received A.A.s from Kirkwood Community College, a 3,000-student, 2-year institution located on the outskirts of the city.

From the beginning, COP Cedar Rapids was an anomaly. Only 7 percent of the 370,000 residents of Area X, the geographical jurisdiction of COP, were in what could be labeled a condition of poverty. But the absence of a concentration of poverty did not serve to ameliorate the situations of those individuals and families that were poor in relative isolation. Instead, it may have broadened its psychological dimensions, for poor children were mixed with prosperous in ways that often impeded COP and adversely affected the participants. In general, however, the advent of the program meant that schools in Area X that might normally not have employed Black or low-income white staff members had new options, exposures, and experiences. The yield from such admixtures was often universally beneficial; when it was something less, at least some new perspectives and understandings emerged.

One constant in COP Cedar Rapids' constantly shifting profile was the performance and role of Kirkwood Community College. At many COP locales, the role of the community college is an almost mechanical one. It starts the participants off in postsecondary education, acclimates them to life on a college campus, and provides basic learning, usually in the form of various types of compensatory or catch-up education in fields that had been neglected or never studied. Not customarily geared to teacher training, the 2-year institutions in COP were limited, as a general rule, to course offerings of broad interest to the communities they served. To its credit, Kirkwood did not view its role in these terms. The first COP student was hardly enrolled before Kirkwood was readying itself to sensitize the "new new professionals" to the teaching profession. It devised special practica, seminars, and methods courses in education, offered them to the COP trainees, and promptly opened them to anyone else with a legitimate interest. Its compensatory (or developmental) courses were also made a permanent part of the curriculum, and the counseling services provided for COP students were similarly expanded to serve the entire student body. With access to Kirkwood's strong, vocational departments, some COP participants were also able to obtain vocational certification to enable them to teach at the community college level.

For its part, Mount Mercy College overcame a slow start in COP. Like other postsecondary establishments throughout the COP system, it designed new courses, offering some at various field bases, and permitted the substituting of actual experience for formal student teaching. However, in the words of Sister Joan Marie of the college, COP "was introduced at Mount Mercy with little understanding on the part of the faculty of the purpose and objectives of the program." That it was eventually integrated into the institution's program testifies to its impact, for Mount Mercy College is neither impressionable nor faddish.

Nashville, Tenn.

Within the Nashville metropolitan area in central Tennessee are country music's Tin Pan Alley, several of the Nation's more prosperous fundamentalist religious publishers, and nine colleges and universities, including nationally known Fisk, Vanderbilt, and Peabody. The city's well-established political individualism, often expressed as a kind of homegrown back-to-basics conservatism, never served so well as in 1971 when it helped the city weather school desegregation. With a population of approximately 600,000, of whom 150,000 (25 percent) are Black, Nashville's school population is roughly 33 percent Black.

Although Nashville-Metro COP enjoyed the virtues of project-wide dedication and participant commitment found throughout the national network, it was often flawed by administrative problems originating in forces far removed from its own crowded, predominantly Black, Model Cities section of north Nashville. Among them, problems like the following sometimes seemed ready to do the program in altogether, or severely cripple it at the very least:

Item 1: A late start, in March 1971, was the consequence when the promised local source of funding for stipends failed to materialize.

Item 2: Only 35 participants, far too small a group to begin to accomplish the goals of an urban COP project, were on hand at the birth. Although 55 eventually passed through the project, the COP banner was raised weakly and haltingly.

Item 3: The Model Cities program, eventually to become a strong COP collaborator, did not provide trainees' salaries until the project was 5 months old. At another juncture less than 2 years later, with the need for summer stipends close at hand in the spring of 1973, Model Cities funding was withdrawn.

Item 4: The Tennessee State Department of Education rejected the career lattice developed by COP for the Nashville system. The turndown diverted the issue into State legislative channels, requiring hearings and committee deliberation which could lead to the burial of the issue. And this process, vital to the legitimization of teacher aides in Tennessee schools, could take years to complete.

Item 5: As an indirect consequence of the city's desegregation actions in 1971, substantial shifts of teaching personnel became necessary throughout the system. In an already cloudy employment situation, this served to further compromise the system's commitment to preferential treatment for COP graduates. The 40 who expected to receive degrees and certification could no longer expect automatic employment in the schools in which they worked as aides. Their best hope as the project approached termination was to remain patient while continuing as aides, with occasional substitute teaching stints.

Item 6: The Nashville system, which in time became thoroughly sold on paraprofessionals in the classroom, had had little experience with them, and individual teachers were only superficially oriented to the roles aides could play.

One of the more reliable features of any COP project was that it would discover—or, more accurately perhaps, disinter—an unused but easily available organization or process or human resource to fill a gap or provide some needed spark. In ideal circumstances, COP literally forced the creation of such bodies or practices if they were not built into the project's design. In others, as in Nashville in 1971, they were there for the asking and using. One such was the Teacher Education Alliance for Metro (TEAM). Funded as a site of the Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program, also a product of EPDA, TEAM spanned all nine of Nashville-Metro's teacher training institutions as a kind of well-connected coordinating body capable of bridging town-gown gaps, sponsoring workshops, and promoting solidly documented innovations in classroom practice and teacher training throughout the area. When TEAM assumed the coordinating role for COP at the higher education level, the project acquired tremendous unanticipated strength and leverage, two half-time coordinators, and a newly important role at the largely Black Tennessee State University (TSU) and the new University of Tennessee at Nashville, the two teacher training institutions that had agreed from the outset to provide university-level instruction for the aides.

Hesitant and apprehensive at first, the COP group (50 of 55 were Black, 7 were Vietnam-era veterans) often encountered resentment and misunderstanding in the schools.

In contrast to COP sites like Minneapolis or New York, Nashville in 1971 had had so little direct exposure to teacher aides (other than ESEA-funded ones who were not involved in teacher training programs and could therefore perform noninstructional tasks more comfortably) that the new paraprofessionals there were often missionaries as well as functioning employees of the system. This was not as Dr. Gen McFarland, the project director, had planned it, but, as seemed to happen throughout the life of Nashville COP, external circumstances intervened.

The desegregation of 1971, which occurred within months of the project's start, provided the COP aides a unique point of entry into the system. As dislocation became reality, the COP participants found a natural niche. Mostly from the toughest sections of town, they played informal but crucial roles as guides and counselors for Black children faced with the uncertainties of movement to predominantly white schools. The veterans in COP performed particularly critical services in secondary school guidance programs where white teachers were frequently at a loss to teach, let alone counsel, youth from the ghettoes. Streetwise and purposeful, the COP people moved with assurance into other trouble spots as well. As COP aides came to be perceived by their master teachers more as a reinforcing presence in the schools, and less as a threat, they found themselves on the road to full acceptance. To Superintendent Elbert Brooks, who wondered why the COP approach had not been tried on a larger scale, COP came "closest to the ideal model for teacher education," while Federal Program Director Douglas Norman found that no other funded program "has been more worthwhile nor given me more satisfaction." Similar approval was echoed throughout the system.

As has been remarked, COP's visibility and effects in urban settings often appeared unremarkable, even though COP may well have helped set the stage for major reforms within the system. This may be true of Nashville teacher training. Although TEA·M no longer coordinates COP's higher educational functions, its work lives on. One aspect, greatly heightened cooperation among the area's nine teacher training institutions, is manifested in a new model teacher education pilot program, with Peabody and TSU as the providers of services to the city school system. Patterned on COP, the program emphasizes early participant involvement in the classroom, field-based instruction, and, to some degree, competency-based teacher training. Along the way to this experiment, COP's higher education affiliates had long since adapted to COP's needs and, in the process, begun to set other forces in motion. Among the adaptations:

- waiving of the examination necessary to enter teacher training,
- granting of credit for on-the-job training,
- acceptance of work experience in lieu of five education courses,
- regular visits by liberal arts (and education) faculty to classrooms where COP trainees were at work, and
- accepting the final year of paraprofessional work experience for the student teaching requirement.

This last innovation is not achieved everywhere in COP; if COP trainees are united on one central complaint about the program, it is that student teaching as a serious requirement is an insult to the professional credibility of the mature and experienced people in the program.

How many of these departures from the norm would have occurred without COP on the Nashville scene is difficult to estimate. It is equally difficult to forecast how many will be accepted practice in 1985. Probably quite a few, long after COP has left Nashville-Metro. For COP introduced Nashville's various systems to a new breed—epitomized by the honor graduates from north Nashville, largely Black, largely female, and all with heavy commitment—and nothing will ever be the same again.

Oakland, Calif.

It has been said that Oakland is San Francisco's "other side." The description, while not entirely accurate, is fairly close to the mark. The least distinctive but most industrial of the urban concentrations in the Bay Area, neither a center of poverty nor one of upward mobility, Oakland has a large and growing set of typically urban problems: unemployment, poor housing, crime, and public apathy. In addition, while the city's population of more than 360,000 is only 34 percent Black, the proportion of Black children in the schools is pushing past 60 percent, and a rapidly growing Mexican-American community augurs a further sharp reordering of the city's makeup in the near future.

The Oakland Unified School District has been a battleground. Name the problem and Oakland has experienced it: racial discrimination, taxpayer refusal to shoulder heavier tax burdens, teacher militancy, below-average test scores, alleged misuse of Federal funds, and on November 15, 1973, the murder of School Superintendent Marcus Foster. To Oakland's minorities, the assassination of this gifted Black leader underscored, as nothing before it, the futility that enveloped public education in an already beleaguered city.

Against this background, it should come as no surprise that the COP project had a difficult birth, that it was plagued by more than the usual complement of human and organizational problems, and that COP's success and integrity depended in large measure on the project's ability to identify itself with hope for Oakland. Nothing was easy; even the trivial came hard.

The Model Cities' role, frequently a boon but sometimes a millstone around the fledgling COP project director's neck, was typical. Penciled in for a large budgetary contribution to supplement the COP contribution, the Oakland Model Cites authority instead came up with only 16 percent ($90,000) of the total $600,000 required. Even before the project was launched, Director Sylvia Faulk was at work creating and packaging a new design. Before she was through, support from Title I had been combined with various contributions from four other sources representing diverse Federal and State activities. At first, as was to be expected, each funding source was banking on a share of project governance in exchange for its contribution. Long negotiations ensued, with the COP advisory council weighing in as well. Director Faulk remained in control.

The project was on the point of initiating discussions with Dr. Foster to obtain his approval for their paraprofessional career lattice when his life was so tragically cut short. And it was only much later that pressure by the teachers' union ultimately persuaded the school district to adopt COP's lattice for *all* aides in the district.

Of the 60 original COP participants, 48, including 9 veterans, were Black, 8 Mexican-American, and 4 Oriental. There were 45 graduates, all in teaching jobs in the Oakland system, before the project's end in mid-1975, and 20 more, including 5 veterans who entered COP late, were scheduled to graduate then. All involved worked in teacher aide slots in 10 target-area schools under the supervision and guidance of 5 team leaders. The trainees studied at five sites, ranging from open admissions community colleges, Alameda and Merritt, to California State University at Hayward, to two esteemed women's colleges, the College of Holy Names and Mills College.

All five institutions cooperated effectively, and the experience of carrying 8 and 11 trainees, respectively, through to hard-earned degrees was probably especially significant for Mills and Holy Names. At both, the participants were figuratively tossed in to sink or swim. On the one hand, this offered the participants a high-quality education and opened the minds of the relatively protected regular students to a larger, tougher world around them. On the other, having small groups of COP participants on the campus for part of the time demonstrated that the colleges could handle a different breed and, in fact, learn from it. The resultant new consciousness was reinforced by specific actions to admit more older women to the two colleges.

In the final analysis, the COP story is found in the downright inspirational people who went the hard route from poverty to professional status. A prime example is that of Carol Freeman, a young Black mother whose odyssey took her from a project behind Oakland's notorious Clawson School to a magna cum laude Mills College degree, a teaching post, and candidacy for a graduate degree. "If it hadn't been for COP," said her first principal, "Carol might have been turned against the system, a brilliantly vicious antagonist."

Assistant Superintendent Viscovich related the story of a woman who had been a classmate of his 25 years before in high school. "But," he said, "I was white and she was black. I had the middle class advantages; she had none, even though she got better grades than I." With a family to support, and no husband, she was forced to go on welfare until she was able to get an instructional assistant position in the school. From there, she moved into COP. Now she is back teaching in Lafayette School, where she and Dr. Viscovich started out. The principal hired her after hearing her valedictory address at the 1974 COP banquet. He has not regretted it. "She has a beautiful touch with small children," he said, "and is a valuable addition to the staff."

Yakima, Wash.

The hub of central Washington's lush farm economy is the medium-sized (46,000 city of Yakima. A major processing and shipping center for agricultural goods, the city seems to enjoy good overall economic health. But this well-being is deceptive. Seasonal unemployment creates hard-to-control fluctuations. Migrant labor with its attendant needs poses a continuing array of difficult problems. Yakima's sub-poverty-line population of nearly 8,000 requires considerable external assistance if it is to be a responsible force in community life, and offers as wide a variety of social and human issues and needs as any in the Pacific Northwest. Hardly typical of urban America, Yakima's minority elements—4-5,000 migrants, plus a range of smaller numbers of permanently residing Blacks (3,000), Spanish-surnamed, Indian, and Oriental populations—are, along with the whites living in poverty, the primary targets of the Yakima COP project.

In some locales, intrepid COP directors had to conceive, design, package, and sell the program to suspicious and resistant higher authority. At a few sites, in fact, there was official doubt, most often expressed by conservative boards and administrators, that valid needs existed and required servicing—unless, of course, COP's national staff insisted on footing the entire bill. Seldom was there explicit recognition, until well along in the project's life cycle, that COP not only represented a solution for many of a community's educational woes but that it possessed high potential as a means to an important social end: building career ladders in the human service fields for those whose experience in these fields had been as recipients rather than as dispensers.

The Yakima COP experience was different. Far from needing persuasion, Yakima School Superintendent Jack Frisk was the drafter of the original COP proposal and went to the Denver founding meeting of COP in 1969 with the hard core of the program's community representation—a Black militant, a Mexican-American woman activist, and an Indian tribal committee member. From its outset, COP Yakima enjoyed this kind of support, and obstacles that were all but insurmountable in many urban COP settings somehow became both manageable and exploitable in this city. With Assistant Director of Federal Programs Keith Wright functioning as COP director on a half-time arrangement, the orchestration of funding sources was smooth, legal, and productive. By the time the COP support package had been assembled, it numbered eight often disparate but surprisingly compatible sources: ESEA Titles I (Disadvantaged) and III; the Migrant Education Program under title I; Head Start; Follow Through; Vocational Education; a Washington State-sponsored program called Urban-Rural Racial Disadvantaged; and the WIN program of the local Manpower Defense Training Act site (which enabled COP to put several aides into the schools even before the project's formal start). These were not merely funding sources, however; as conceived by Dr. Frisk and the COP establishment, they also represented training options which might not otherwise have been available to the participants.

Averaging 32 COP trainees at a given time (60 percent white, 20 percent Black, and the remainder Mexican-American or other), the Yakima project had produced 13 graduates by the end of 1974, with 14 more scheduled to get their degrees and teaching certificates simultaneously with the project's mid-1975 termination. But participant graduation was only one of COP Yakima's objectives. Of at least equal importance was paraprofessionalism. Strongly convinced of the virtues of teacher aides, as evidenced in a paraprofessional population of 275 to work with a professional staff of 600, the system needed codification and institutionalization. These were provided through the example of COP, and a career lattice was created for all of the system's paraprofessionals. It outlines responsibilities, educational requirements, income levels, terms of employment, and fringe benefits for five clearly distinct but closely linked levels. Aides in Yakima's schools are now a permanent part of the work force, an accomplishment for which the COP example is conceded much of the credit.

In Yakima, as in every COP entity in the country, participants subjected themselves to demands, sacrifices, and life-style changes that would be nearly unimaginable in middle-class, suburban America. In Adams School, a COP graduate armed with a Rutgers M.A. teaches a third-grade class that may one day realize what this welfare veteran, high school dropout, single parent of four has achieved. Her story is matched, with variations in details only, by Jesse, a Black veteran from the ghetto, by Felix Martinez and his two brothers, and too many others to mention.

The Yakima COP enterprise was rounded out by a representative advisory council which, however, was meeting only rarely as the project neared the conclusion of its 5-year cycle; a project staff with only one full-time member, a counselor who saw to participant needs, institutional linkages at the working level, and routine counseling requirements, among other things, and five team leaders who received small annual increments.

Two postsecondary institutions, Yakima Valley Community College and Central Washington State College, a 4-year institution located in nearby Ellensburg, offered school-based courses in Yakima for the COP trainees and did a fine job of designing schedules—a large task requiring heavy rescheduling since very little released time was given COP aides (due to fears that the other 200-plus non-COP aides would feel discriminated against). For their part, the COP aides represented a challenging new dimension in the lives of the institutions. They are serious, older than the average, questioning, intellectually demanding, and strongly career-oriented. To the surprise of many on both campuses, their academic achievements measured up to the norm—and frequently surpassed it.

Cleveland, Ohio

On its all too rare good days, Cleveland is a bustling industrial city rich in ethnic and minority cultural values, a lakefront gateway to Canada and middle America and, as evidenced by the election of a Black mayor in the 1960s before it had become fashionable, an important center of creative political democracy. Then there are the other days when the smog-covered city on polluted Lake Erie becomes a hotbed of racial strife. But if Cleveland is not a happy place, it is not a hopelessly gloomy one, either. And to many on Cleveland's educational scene, its COP project exemplifies an approach that could become an important one in addressing the city's chronic social problems.

COP Cleveland emerges from close scrutiny as a nearly prototypical, urban COP project, especially when viewed in the contest of such preconditions as:

- racial tension exemplified in the Hough riots of 1966,
- city-wide division into racial and ethnic enclaves,
- a Model Cities administration in full ferment when the project was launched,
- minority distrust of a majority-run school system, and
- a veteran school superintendent whose support of COP stemmed from his connections, to the Bay City teacher aides experiment that helped trigger the national movement a generation ago.

COP Cleveland was not an overwhelmingly Black project. Its average of 75-90 participants usually ran about 50 percent Black, 28 percent Appalachian white, and 22 percent Spanish-speaking (mostly Puerto Rican, but some Mexican-American)—totals which reflected the composition of Cleveland's East Side and part of the inner city. Not included were the many ethnic groups descended from the Eastern European immigrants. Those who had not moved to the suburbs were still well above the income levels of the COP world, and their view of COP-type arrangements was at best indifferent.

At the COP site, the travail of birth and early growth was unusually strenuous, more so than in most COP projects. Deeply suspicious of the school system, the Black nationalists in control of the Model Cities Association wanted no part of a commitment to collaborate with white minorities. Nor did they care a great deal about cooperating with the school system itself. It mattered little that the Appalachian whites were among the city's dispossessed and shared many of the Blacks' grievances. The job of reconciliation fell to teacher-activist Charles

Cox, who negotiated nonstop until, weeks after their firm rejection of COP, the Model Cities militants reluctantly agreed to cooperate.

Another early problem was governance. With Model Cities funding assured and Cox established as COP director, the next step was the formation of an advisory council to assist Cox and assure projectwide representation. But Cox, who had lived and taught in explosive Hough, was considered to be a Black Trojan horse whose sympathy with the values of the other groups would be minimal. Without retreating from his fundamental beliefs, he managed to overcome this impression, largely by practical demonstrations of its fallaciousness. It was worth the effort. The Cleveland COP Council, with its Black, Spanish-speaking, and Appalachian community members, COP aides, school and Cleveland Teacher's Union representation, and delegates from Cleveland State University (CSU) and Cuyahoga Community College (CCC), was the project's prod and conscience. Unlike many other councils which were relegated to the sidelines within a year of the activation of COP projects, the Cleveland Council remained involved, concerned, and, fortunately, contentious throughout its 5-year life.

The early role of this COP project's higher education component was instructive. The agreed-upon scheme for the project called for trainees to work split shifts: classroom work for half the day and college work the other half, an arrangement that indicated an extraordinarily cooperative attitude on the part of the school system. (More typical were the systems that permitted no release time, or minimal amounts like 3 to 5 hours a week.) This was evidently too much for the two postsecondary establishments, which declared the arrangement an impossible strain on their regulations and practices. The COP participants themselves intervened noisily but effectively, and accommodation was eventually reached.

In the 5th year of COP, some of its key staff personnel, mostly directors who had traveled the 5-year route, were wistfully lamenting the passing of the "good old days" when confrontation was a normal occurrence throughout the COP chain. As projects like Cleveland's earned their spurs by demonstrating the virtues of the COP idea in action, problem solving became a less momentous affair. Relationships had achieved a respectable level of civility, even of mutual respect, by the 2d year of the projects. Issues that would have been fought on center stage in 1970 were treated almost routinely in 1971 and 1972. By 1975, the former battlegrounds, in Cleveland as elsewhere, were almost still.

Life with COP's two postsecondary institutions in Cleveland was a series of adjustments—some painful, none easy. Once past the issue of split days, one of the most critical issues to arise was the refusal of Cleveland State to accept certain credits granted by Cuyahoga. Eventually, all but remedial education credits were recognized, a reinforced A.A. degree conferring the status of educational technologist was approved and granted to some 50 COP aides by late 1974, and more realistic linkages between the two institutions were developed which will doubtless survive COP's departure. All of this took time, tact, and patience—qualities often in short supply in COP's earlier, more frenetic days, but increasingly apparent as the project gained maturity.

On COP Cleveland's other fronts, two additional achievements—the development of a career lattice/ladder for paraprofessionals and the institution of an imaginative student teaching scheme—merit mention. The first, not unlike those stimulated by COP in States and school systems throughout the country, spelled out a five-step progression: Educational Aide I or Assistant, Educational Aide II or Associate, Educational Technologist (a variation on most ladders), Intern Teacher, and Student Teacher. The student teaching arrangement, designed in conjunction with the New Careers Training Laboratory, was a yearlong, half-day regimen in which the COP aide worked through progressively difficult classroom situations while being assisted throughout by a cooperating teacher specifically trained for the job. This teacher, as well as the cooperating principal, received special instruction and graduate credit.

In terms of vital statistics and general background, the Cleveland COP participants did not deviate appreciably from the national pattern—82 percent female, age range from 19 to 56, a handful of veterans, almost unbelievable diversity of previous experience (including an Appalachian veteran with seven children, who finished in near-record time while working as a bouncer in a bar)—although much can legitimately be made of the spirit and good feeling that pervaded this project. Even the organizations only tangentially involved are not hesitant to voice their pride in COP. Evidence of this pride has often made itself tangible, most notably when the COP community generated 4,000 letters to Ohio's Senators at a time of apparent peril for EPDA.

Chapter 6. In the Country: Large Waves in Small Ponds

With 75-80 percent of COP projects based in cities, the program's emphasis was unabashedly urban, and probably appropriately so. The New York City project, as mentioned earlier, touched the lives of more children and teacher aides than all of the rural/reservation/barrio COP enterprises described in this section put together.

Nonetheless, it is fortunate that the urban setting did not become COP's only arena, for among the program's many serendipities, COP's success in nonurban settings ranks high. A well-run 50-aide project serving a COP jurisdiction of, say, 35,000 people will pack a more powerful wallop than that of a 100-participant enterprise in a city of a million. The smaller scale of the first project renders it inherently more manageable, even when nonurban geography and greater distances between actors make communication more difficult. In nonurban settings, such difficulties are compensated for by familiar relationships among people and institutions with virtues and shortcomings of old friends long since acknowledged and accepted. No one is lost in the shuffle. To the contrary, some participants and staff members in COP's nonurban world mention the "goldfish bowl" in which they work, often as full-fledged classroom teachers lacking only degrees, licenses, and half of the pay of the "regulars." They do not occupy that bowl alone, however. The interplay among the cohabitants frequently produces collaborations that the impersonality of life in a metropolitan school system tends, more often than not, to obscure or inhibit.

In the cities, COP was one element in a larger mosaic of training and retraining efforts embracing the school system, the several teacher training institutions which traditionally stock it, the receiving community, and that phenomenon of the post-1965 education scene, the U.S. government-sponsored teacher training program. The COP role is finite: it is the paraprofessional piece and a potential supplier of indigenous licensed teachers. In COP's smaller, simpler, nonurban world, though, it is often much more. It may be an important device for catalyzing innovation, a community force, or even the educational means to social action. In some of its backwaters, COP is the leading agent of fundamental social, political, cultural, and even economic change.

The "small pond" COP projects resist easy categorization. While sharing certain characteristics, they break from most of those typical of urban projects. Early in the COP process, for example, direct financial and programmatic affiliation with Model Cities neighborhood organizations was, in many locations, a necessary precondition of COP's very existence. Except in rare instances, this could not occur in the countryside, with the unhappy result that some of the nonurban COP projects operated on very lean budgets.

The impact of 50 new jobs on an impoverished Indian reservation is tangible and measurable in social and economic terms. Unlike the big city schools, which had been utilizing schoolroom aides in ever-larger numbers since the early 1960s, many of the small, rural systems added paraprofessionals to their staffs for the first time when COP and its dollars appeared.

Two other COP elements—the communities and the teacher training institutions—were rather different breeds outside the metropolitan COP setting. The close personal relations within rural or nonurban projects, and even among separate communities, guaranteed direct lay participation in the COP project's affairs. The COP participants were neighbors, and they were in daily contact with the children of neighbors and lifelong friends. With COP a major feature of the community's educational life, service on a COP advisory board was in many cases a privilege rather than an unwelcome burden. If geography restricted the number of meetings that could be held, most of those that *were* held were vastly rewarding.

It remains to be seen whether COP figured larger in the lives of the nonurban teacher training institutions than it did in the huge urban universities. Yet there is no doubt that COP was especially effective in the countryside in helping to bridge long-standing chasms between the public schools and nearby colleges and universities. Curriculums were adjusted to fit specific sets of conditions. Onsite instruction, offered for the first time by many of the institutions, came to be taken for granted throughout rural/reservation/mountain COP projects. The granting of credit for "life experience," an accepted practice in many inner-city-oriented institutions, was widely adopted in the country. New course units were developed to help participants codify and advance what they had learned in the well-known "college of hard knocks" during the 10, 20, or even 35 or 40 years since departing the formal classroom. Many of these—special education for the non-English-speaking child, examinations in depth of certain tribal characteristics of reservation-bound Indians, methods of teaching bicultural concepts—imposed new problems and conferred new competencies alike on the colleges involved.

At project after urban project, the values and physical facts of life are those of Black America—engaged in overdue national, educational upgrading, carving a still inadequate niche in public education, defining and redefining the imperatives of teaching Black children in multicultural America. Not so in COP's "small pond" world, where more specialized or less well-known project emphases emerge. But these preoccupations are no less instructive for being relatively underpublicized. For Chicanos, Native Americans, Appalachian whites, and others, the grip of poverty is just as tight, and the history of exploitation and discrimination is well documented. And it is just these themes that help to build a fuller, better rounded, COP national picture.

Hardin, Mont.

There is no such thing as a typical American Indian tribe. Life-styles, values, and economic status show an ever-widening range. Educational levels and attitudes toward learning also vary widely. Indian views of the prevailing mass culture of whites range from casual acceptance to angry rejection. In no two nations, let alone a single tribal unit, would identical outlooks on the future of Native Americans be found.

Among the Crow and Northern Cheyenne Indians of the Big Horn sector of southeastern Montana, one certain feature is that their lives abound in contradictions and perplexities. From there, the resemblances diminish. Both the Crow and Northern Cheyenne are rediscovering their history. Education, specifically that part of it being addressed to rebuilding linguistic and cultural consciousness, is the means to this end.

The Hardin, Mont., COP program for the Northern Cheyenne and Crow reservations is part of this picture. Spread across range land and coal-laden hills covering an area only slightly smaller than the State of Connecticut, the two reservations are together inhabited by fewer than 8,000 tribal members—roughly 4,500 Crows and slightly over 3,000 Northern Cheyennes. Of these, not quite 2,000 are students more or less regularly attending the reservations' schools. Adult male unemployment runs from 35 to 40 percent, greatly overshadowing even the crippling effects of 8 or 9 percent unemployment, including both sexes, in the Nation as a whole. Seen close up, the terrain is more inhospitable than scenic. Frequently the innocent source of controversy, as when it is massively gashed by the strip-mining machinery of the coal companies, the land makes its presence felt by repercussion all the way to the Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the New York *Times*. The issue of the relationship between the people, their land, and "big coal" more than any other has driven home to the two tribes the necessity of achieving a position of strength from which to negotiate with the white man at the bargaining table. For the long run, the natural places to begin, the consensus goes, are in the schools and in the courts.

Not limited to the problems created by strip mining, sore spots afflicting these Native American tribal populations span an array of important issues that even a decade of greatly expanded Federal assistance has only begun to address. They include: the retrieval of cultural heritages, the elevation of low living standards, the creation of opportunities for rewarding employment, and, basic to all, the development of educational systems and values responsive to the changing needs of these tribes. Such systems and values, based on vastly improved self-images as American Indians, must be capable of equipping the Northern Cheyenne and Crow societies to deal forcefully with the threats to their existence that even a markedly more enlightened Federal policy has been unable to diminish.

The Crow/Northern Cheyenne COP project may be seen as a political and cultural entity, or as "purely" educational. The project, in fact, by focusing on the "purely" educational, while touching almost every facet of tribal life, mirrors both the issues and the promise of life on the Crows' 1.57 million-acre and the Northern Cheyenne's 443,000-acre preserves.

In 1969, 3 percent of the teachers on the two reservations came from the tribes themselves. The remainder, capable and responsive though many of them were, still functioned at a cultural remove from tribal life. Although the spoken languages were deeply embedded in tribal life, neither tribe had a written language, and even the use of the spoken one in the schools was officially discouraged by school authorities. Except for certain privately financed, religiously oriented schools (of which the famous, well-endowed St. Labre Catholic school, at the edge of the Northern Cheyenne reservation, is the best example) facilities were generally inadequate, and educational technology was a fantasy rather than a fact of life. The dropout rate was astronomical. Of those who remained in school, an alarmingly high proportion, often those most successful at their studies, was dispatched to boarding school, too frequently as an initial permanent step away from tribal life.

COP has not changed all of this. No amount of external material assistance can eliminate or even significantly ease historic pressures in less than a decade, let alone within the 5-year span allotted to the Career Opportunities Program. Although COP may address as many problems as effectively as any of its companion programs, it cannot and does not claim credit for the gradual changes that most on-the-scene observers agree are taking place on the Crow and Northern Cheyenne reservations.

One of COP's acknowledged strengths, according to Hardin School District Superintendent Willard R. Anderson and COP Director Don W. Douglas, a Blackfeet Indian, is that it dovetails so constructively with the 30-plus other Federal education-related activities serving the same people. These include the programs of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, ESEA Title I, Follow Through, Basic Adult Education, Right to Read, Teacher Corps, Johnson-O'Malley, etc. Fortunately, there is rationality in the interrelationships; during the past several years, various combinations, notably those involving the bilingual and teacher training programs, especially COP and Teacher Corps, have brought important strength to the separate but similar struggles of the Crows and Northern Cheyennes to reestablish their tribal identities. To consider COP in isolation would be to slight the larger context in which it operates.

A pastiche of opinions—from educators, participants, and community representatives—on what COP and COP-connected activities mean to this all-Indian project's 44 participants, the 12 schools involved, Eastern Montana College, and the children whose lives are touched by it includes these elements:

- It sparked the large-scale breakthrough that will have helped put 40 certified Native American teachers (instead of the 7 of 1969) into the 210 teaching posts in the affected area by mid-1975.
- The large-scale introduction of local tribespeople into the educational system has all but revolutionized tradition-bound schools that had been staffed almost exclusively by non-Indians.
- It has represented the best of all possible worlds by spurring professional legitimization for the COP participants while enhancing their potential as custodians and disseminators of the sociocultural riches of American Indians.
- The newly acquired paraprofessional status of many of the tribeswomen has strengthened geographical and family ties in circumstances where these bonds had shown signs of weakening.
- Observing their parents and their friends' parents at work in the classroom, some as full-fledged teachers, has put the children under a new kind of pressure, more often than not beneficial, to emulate and achieve educationally.
- At Eastern Montana College (EMC) in Billings, a 3,600-student institution which provides the project's higher educational training and resources (with a Northern Cheyenne tribe member as coordinator), COP was considered a model of how field-based college instruction can be offered on Indian reservations (by imaginative arrangements involving videotaped lectures and EMC-chartered weekly flights).
- Of overwhelming import, COP has been a central element in the efforts of these tribes to use their rich languages and cultures as key resources in achieving their basic tribal goals.

Bilingual education has constituted the hub of COP project operations and intellectual life. On the Crow reservation, a felicitous blending of several Federal programs, with COP a prominent partner, has animated the development of a soundly based orthography for the Crow language, an undertaking that has consumed the energies of three scientific linguists who have taken up residence at or near the Crow agency. Of even more direct relevance to the schools, the mode of instruction is becoming bilingual and bicultural, more so up to now in Crow country but increasingly so in schools serving the Northern Cheyennes. At Crow Agency Elementary School, virtually all pupils, including the offspring of white BIA and other non-Indian residents, are deeply involved in this exciting undertaking.

The 44 COP trainees feel they are making personal contributions to the tribal effort at regeneration. They are hopeful that their own futures, which so importantly label those of their children, will have more secure underpinnings, both psychologically and in career status. Undertaking their own further education and preparing themselves to teach the children of their reservations, these 41 women and 3 men have drastically altered their lifestyles. They have undergone massive inconvenience, including annual summer moves to the impersonal big city, Billings, where Eastern Montana College is located. And they have immersed themselves in intellectual pursuits for which their earlier, often only vaguely remembered educational backgrounds, had not adequately prepared most of them.

For its crucial part in the COP process, Eastern Montana College came prepared. It has practiced much of what it has preached about competency-based education, with the result that individual COP trainees have accrued credits for previous experience, linguistic competence, and certain other cognitive skills, without having to take unnecessary college courses. Similarly, Eastern Montana, the project, and the teacher licensing authority within the Montana Department of Public Instruction have collaborated to obtain a waiver of half of the State's requirement of 16 student teaching credits. Amicable intra-project arrangements have long since diminished the obviously unnecessary features of the remaining eight credits. With its growing involvement in Indian education, EMC is developing flexibility. It can and does design and tailor courses to fit the needs of participants. In the words of a deeply involved faculty member, "We've learned to take them where they are and to avoid burdening them with rigid formality." This widely shared outlook on COP has become an important part of COP lore in many parts of the country.

Throughout this COP project, there is a perceptible Indian wish to coexist with majority white politics and culture, profitably and with dignity. To drive the mining companies and other exploiters all the way out would be to deprive a desperately needy economy of cash, employment, and the prospect of some measure of prosperity. To accept them on honorable, mutually beneficial terms would be the beginning of wisdom. And education, as exemplified by the massive effort in which COP plays such an important part, is the principal means to that wisdom. To quote an otherwise militant COP participant:

> We can't retreat into a cultural shell. Even our best Indian learning does not properly equip us to live in white America, except as curiosities. When all is said and done, we don't want 100 percent Indian teachers on this reservation. Half and half would be just right. That way we'll learn more about ourselves but be able to meet the rest of you on common ground.

Waterbury, Vt.

The Vermont COP enterprise, which is like no other, exemplifies one extreme in the broad national spectrum of COP projects. Tucked along the valleys and country roads of rural, north-central Vermont, cheek by jowl with the East's favorite ski resorts, its serene setting is misleading. For the COP project of Washington West School District (WWSD) has generated enough explosiveness for five larger-sized COP establishments. Its widely scattered but tightly knit group of 12 remaining participants ("interns" in Vermont COP parlance) comprises a network which deeply affects the six school communities—five elementary (Waterbury, Warren, Waitsfield, Fayston, Moretown) and one secondary (Harwood Union High School)—in which they serve. Their effect, as part of the overall impact of COP in the area, has been "substantial and lasting," according to Superintendent Robert B. Kautz. Intimately aware of COP's catalytic potential, Kautz has become sold on the role teacher aides have played in his district's classrooms and is strongly committed to supporting the efforts toward "institutionalization" that project Director Jullian Otten had already begun in the project's 4th year.

The rural COP project in Vermont has managed, on a relatively small canvas, to embody many of the virtues and to avoid most of the pitfalls of a federally underwritten, pilot project. Although never designated as a prototype of modest Federal intervention, it may have evolved into just that. With the smallest participant population and one of the smallest budgets in the COP national network, the Waterbury-based endeavor nevertheless attempted and accomplished much. The virtues of its modest size (but relatively high per-intern cost) are several. No one gets lost in the administrative shuffle. Individual interns are highly visible and thus readily accountable. Too, a cast of 12 may be an ideal size for testing and determining the efficacy of various approaches to teaching and learning. Perhaps even more telling, this COP project has demonstrated that small populations can make big waves.

There are only so many instructional designs for COP projects. With the participants committed to near full-time work as school-based paraprofessionals, time for their own academic pursuits, let alone personal lives, is limited. The choices—and these are not always available—are release time, late afternoons and evenings, heavy doses of summer course work, and, in extreme cases, weekends. Because many of the Vermont participants are married homemakers with school-aged children—or married veterans, or unwed or separated/divorced parents—all with the crushing burdens of economically marginal living, it became clear that special arrangements would have to be made for their college work.

For the University of Vermont (UVM) in Burlington, the challenge of meeting the COP participants' large and varied educational needs in 1971 was not precisely tailor-made for its capacities or inclinations. This highly regarded university, one of the "name" colleges in the COP universe, had neither specialized in field-centered instruction nor, given the State's geography, was there any great likelihood that it would be called upon to do so. With the funding of COP, and UVM's relative accessibility (35 miles) to COP's Waterbury base (in the absence at that time of a community college or other higher education institution) however, it was quickly evident that the option of remaining almost entirely campus-based had become impractical. A compromise arrangement was reached whereby the interns received university-generated onsite instruction, took a substantial percentage of course work at the Burlington campus, and, in one of this project's more noteworthy departures, received UVM credit for offerings by the project director and others recruited by her who were only indirectly affiliated with the university. All of this produced what one of the interns described as "an excellent college education" although, as another commented, "It's kind of long on process and a bit short on content." That it occurred at all is a small miracle, given that one of the speakers was 10 years beyond an indifferent high school career and the other had, by her own account, stumbled through "various nothing jobs" before joining COP. Not to be overlooked, according to Dean Corrigan of the School of Education and Social Services, was UVM's readiness to admit mature students on a flexible basis for the first time.

In two constructive respects, the Washington West School District COP organization pulled off what would have been considered unachievable by most of the large, city-based COP enterprises: first, the development with the school system of broadly based linkages that far exceed the requirements of the project's dozen paraprofessionals; and second, solid progress toward the permanent institutionalization of the COP idea in the Washington West School District. As the project's documentation accurately attests, "The direction and energy of COP have all but merged with the direction and energy of WWSD."

Beyond this, the COP project has brought higher education to the district through courses for the interns which are also attended by teachers, community representatives, and anyone else interested in the subject matter. It has published an attractive newsletter which serves as a message center/bulletin board on education in the district as a whole.

The COP office itself has become a curriculum materials center and library for the district, while the project has partially sponsored or underwritten short-term training for school personnel, acted as a collection/distribution base for a recycling effort, and, perhaps most important, on the basis of the interns' performance, persuaded the WWSD of the virtues of paraprofessionals. In practical terms, this has resulted in the assumption by the district of as much as 75 percent of the aides' salaries, a major achievement in frugal Vermont.

To Director Otten, the institutionalization of COP meant demonstrating the potential of teacher aides in a district which had not previously employed them, and going on to consolidate and advance what COP had installed rather than lobbying for extended Federal support. As the COP generation of paraprofessionals began moving into teaching roles (with some, to be sure, content to remain and grow as aides), Ms. Otten designed and won WWSD approval for a new program to attract "volunteers" into the schools. These volunteers, spanning almost the same 40-year range as the interns, would eventually be filtered into the district's schools, but not until they, the vanguard of WWSD's new paraprofessional corps, had undergone a comprehensive COP-directed period of orientation. This was begun, with an eye cocked to the future, on a cold October morning in the project's 4th year. Even the physical surroundings, togetherness induced by the heat from a pot-bellied stove in a rural Vermont church meeting house, were indigenous and propitious.

Thus the Vermont enterprise may be a model of a promising design: Federal support for one finite activity which primes other worthy pumps, catalyzes new linkages, and fixes precise responsibilities on institutions that provide specific services. The most important lessons Washington West has experienced with COP appear to have emerged from the small scale of the project, the extraordinary capabilities of a director who did not come from the school district hierarchy and therefore did not have to consider the implications of returning to it, and a healthy skepticism about overdependence on external, nonrenewable support. But that's the way it is in Vermont—and probably nowhere else.

Martinsburg, W.Va.

To the outsider, West Virginia's eastern panhandle epitomizes the State's self-proclaimed image as "almost heaven." Nearly coterminous with the 3,400-plus square miles covered by the COP project headquartered at Martinsburg, this scenic Appalachian highland area abounds in open spaces and natural wonders. Close to the megalopolitan eastern seaboard—Washington and Baltimore are but an hour's drive from Harper's Ferry, W.Va.—the panhandle has nonetheless retained its rural ambiance. In the bargain, though, much of its population subsists on incomes that remain near the poverty line, and the area continues to be unevenly and inadequately developed.

The COP project spanning West Virginia's 8-county Regional Education Service Agency (RESA) VIII has had to cope with certain disagreeable facts of life. Distances between institutions and people are not only long, they represent hard travelling in hilly country mainly traversed by curving 2-lane roads (except for one 11-mile respite of superhighway). The cooperating institution, Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, on the Maryland border, is as much as 100 miles from some of the COP communities. The advisory council, a serious and involved group, can meet only rarely and must, in the long intervals between sessions, conduct business by telephone and written communication. Were the project in less capable hands, such conditions could greatly reduce cohesiveness. Fortunately, this is not the case for COP Martinsburg.

In some COP sites, paraprofessionals are relegated to narrow specializations, and their classroom accomplishments are deemed to be the main measure of project success. In others, a charismatic director dominates the scene and literally forces public recognition of COP. In still others, the prevailing theme is community action in which COP becomes part of a concerted socio-political campaign directed to one worthy purpose or another. And finally, for a growing number of sites, the future professional lives of the participants and staff become the controlling concern. In varying degrees, COP Martinsburg embraces all of these characteristics, save one: there is virtually no narrow specialization.

It seems that the amount of time a COP aide actually spends teaching increases with the project's distance from large population centers, and the Martinsburg-based project is a good example of this. Although a substantial percentage of the participants perform clearly paraprofessional functions, for an equally large group, the name of the job is classroom teaching. And that is what they were doing almost from the start of the program, usually under the supervision of a master teacher, but still in close-to-independent circumstances. Almost all in this category were openly confident of their ability to assume full classroom responsibility. Director Martha Josephs reckoned that 25-30 of the 85-90 participants who were still taking course work in the 1974-75 school year would graduate, with almost all receiving teaching posts.

To the remaining participants, COP has brought the identity and dignity of the paraprofessional role, which had previously been an insignificant one in the panhandle's school systems. With strong support from the State Department of Education, the RESA VIII COP project and Shepherd College together designed a paraprofessional Associate of Arts (or Science) degree program for instructional aides. It parallels and eventually links up with the regular 4-year sequence. Fully implemented in the 1972-73 school year, it established criteria for paraprofessional training at Shepherd and created a 64-hour, 2-year sequence for paraprofessionals which faculty and participants agree is a rounded intellectual experience richly deserving of 2-year associate degree status. The program tilts heavily in the direction of practical, site-centered instruction, with field-based professors supervising aides on the job, instructing regular classroom teachers in the use of paraprofessionals, and coordinating the instructional programs of the COP participants. The heart of the effort is an 18-credit package consisting of weekly field practica: I—improving children's language arts; II—covering elementary mathematics and physical education; III—emphasizing the communication of scientific investigation and the development of creativity in art for elementary pupils; and IV—assisting aides in special education and in teaching basic musical concepts. Some of the aides have limited themselves to the 18, while others have continued to the A.A. or A.S. level.

The RESA VIII COP project does not suffer from false modesty, nor is the project director at all shy about proclaiming such virtues and accomplishments as: second chances where firsts had been nonexistent; enhanced self-images and confidence in personal potential; more help for underserved children; an unusually high percentage of males, including Vietnam-era veterans and a retired Marine Corps sergeant; probable institutionalization of the paraprofessional presence in the schools that serve RESA VIII's 32,112 children; demonstrable changes in public attitudes toward direct community involvement in the educational process among the area's 125,000-plus persons; and, in varying degrees, certain shifts in the way area colleges and school systems view one another.

Especially noteworthy is the enormous impact that the COP effort has had on teacher training at Shepherd College. A State college with 1,500 of its 2,245 students involved in teacher education programs, turning out competent classroom teachers for its corner of West Virginia as well as for nearby States, Shepherd was a reluctant party to the original COP Martinsburg arrangement. When RESA staff member Cliff Eagleton sought to sell the college administration on designing a teacher training model for the COP recruits—a group of more than 100 former clerks, veterans, housewives, waitresses, cashiers, and assorted others—word came from the offices of the president and dean: "Keep Eagleton out of here—he's crazy."

Four years later, Shepherd College's teacher education program was undergoing a sea change. The Experimental Program in Elementary Education (EXEL), which offered all elementary education majors a classroom role by the end of the sophomore year, was a visible outgrowth of the COP program Shepherd had initially rejected. In its flyer proclaiming EXEL, Shepherd credits COP with introducing the concept of "substituting classroom experience early and continuously, with methods handled in weekly seminars, in lieu of the teaching block." The advantages of the EXEL combination of college classes, classroom experience, and site-based instruction are, in the words of the program's publicists, "a chance to find out early if teaching is for you, opportunity to experience many, different school situations (open, traditional, primary, upper elementary) rather than just one, and learning by doing." Although initially planned at an annual level of 25 students, the program has attracted enormous interest and is considered to be a harbinger of further innovation and development at Shepherd.

The RESA VIII-Shepherd College example presents a potentially irritating paradox, namely, that, while the need for COP-type services may be more striking in centers of urban blight, the prospects for early returns on large investments are better in relatively uncomplicated areas, well removed from the numerous, diverse pressures of the inner city. Given a proper measure of enlightened leadership, projectwide dedication, and a willingness to take risks, all of which were present in RESA VIII COP, barriers of geography and personal inconvenience can be overcome. But combine these with severe racial tension, steadily high crime rates, and submarginal living conditions, and the prospects for reform at any point in the system are scant. Survival must precede progress.

Crystal City, Tex.

With abundant wells and streams to irrigate the fields and under a benevolent sun, the land of Zavala County in southern Texas has become rich and productive. Zavala and neighboring Dimmit County call themselves the "Wintergarden of Texas," while Crystal City, the Zavala County seat, proclaims itself the "Spinach Capital of the World," a label officially sanctioned by the larger-than-life statue of Popeye outside the municipal administration building.

The problem in Crystal City (known as "Cristal" to its inhabitants) is that absentee landlords, large corporations, and other similar interests appear to control its economic destiny. All land holdings exceeding 300 acres belong to such entities as the Del Monte Corporation, Continental Oil, and, until recently, John B. Connally (19,519 acres). The population of a little over 8,000, of whom over 90 percent are Mexican-Americans, fluctuates widely but predictably; beginning in March, fully 70 percent of Crystal City's inhabitants, including children of school age, become migrant laborers throughout the northern half of the United States, until October when Zavala's own winter vegetable growing and processing season begins.

Until the early 1970's, the fate of the overwhelmingly Mexican-American school population was in the hands of an overwhelmingly "Anglo" professional school staff. And like all too many other predominantly Mexican-American cities in south Texas, Crystal City could offer some of the more depressing circumstances to be found in any educational system in the country over the past 15 years. The median education level was 2.3 years in 1960. The school dropout rate reached 80 percent as recently as 1972. Reading comprehension, in both Spanish and English, was nearly two years below national averages in 1973. College education was a fantasy for all but a tiny fraction of the few high school graduates. Over 92 percent of the schoolchildren were eligible for and receiving free lunch and breakfast.

What has been happening to the students, community, and school system of Crystal City since 1970—with COP occupying a frontline position—is this: based on Cristal's dramatic assertion of its Chicano identity, a massive elevation of standards and achievement has been occurring, and the town's political and social upheaval is already having far-reaching effects elsewhere in Texas and the Southwest.

The story of Cristal, the first sizable community in America to be governed by its Chicano majority, is not unknown in "Anglo" America. It has been recounted in serious political studies, Federal evaluations, and the media. Cristal had previously been the scene of a series of political and educational confrontations, but when its more than 90 percent Chicano population finally descended on the polls en masse in 1970, the inevitable occurred. And the result of this mass participation in the political process was a complete transformation of the daily, civic reality in Cristal: unswerving goal orientation, zealous exclusion of the old order, and, at the most basic level, a total upgrading of the educational profile of the populace.

From the first moments of the Chicano takeover of the city council and school board in 1970, accomplished legally by the election of candidates of *La Raza Unida*, an emerging Mexican-American political force, life in Cristal has been a communitywide learning experience. With a Chicano superintendent and school board, the community's educational objectives immediately became clear. First, of course, was to create an educated citizenry as quickly as possible in order to reverse 50 years of what Cristal's official publications call "exclusion, exploitation, alienation, and distrust." Only slightly less urgent was the development of a comprehensive approach to bicultural, bilingual education in Cristal's four schools. But to accomplish these aims, it would be necessary to secure every penny of Federal money that could be pried out of Washington.

By mid-1971, Cristal had a COP project, spawned in the community and populated exclusively by Chicanos. From the outset, its greatest emphasis was on bilingual instruction for elementary schoolchildren. Given its 50 participants and an overhead staff, the COP project was an important source of postsecondary school employment in job-poor Cristal. The COP purpose was clear: to produce a crop of well-trained, home-grown teachers capable of developing the highest possible Chicano consciousness and civic pride in Cristal's schoolchildren. According to the majority wisdom, if the kids also emerged favorably attuned to *La Raza Unida*, so much the better.

By late 1973, COP's 50 participants were serving in schools whose student body was 99.04 percent Mexican-American and 87 percent of whom came from families at or below the poverty line. Although the participants averaged an unusually low 24 years og age, most had endured the debilitating experience of migrant work, not just as children of migrant workers but as 9- or 10-year-old applepickers in Michigan and field hands in North Dakota. Many lacked high school diplomas, in some cases by 4 or 5 years of classroom work, but obtained General Equivalency Diplomas (GED). Male participants, five of them Vietnam-era veterans, have numbered from 35-50 percent of the total, a fact that has significant implications for the makeup of Cristal's educational staff later in the decade. As paraprofessional classroom aides, they are filling a new role in the community's schools. According to Superintendent Amancio Cantu, aides worked in noninstructional capacities prior to COP; Cristal's COP trainees function almost exclusively as teachers.

The larger design which embraces the Cristal COP project sees COP's product as the vanguard of the municipality's future teaching force. The project is not training paraprofessionals; it is preparing teachers through a process in which classroom experience is a central feature. By the termination of the project in mid-1976—it began a year later than the bulk of the projects in the COP network—all but a handful of those still aboard will have become licensed, degree-holding teachers. There were already 17 graduates by the summer of 1974, with 13 more projected for June 1975. Employment in Cristal is all but guaranteed.

Further, non-COP-based opportunities for advancement and additional credentialing have been plentiful. Of the 17 COP trainees who graduated in or before 1974, 11 entered a Cristal-based graduate program offered by Chicago State University (CSU) under the USOE-supported Crystal City Urban/Rural School Development Program. In addition, the Carnegie Foundation supports a San Diego State University program for training school administrators that will presumably provide additional paths for COP graduates to explore. Project Director Richard Gatica, a COP graduate, is pursuing his M.A. at Chicago State University. According to Superintendent Cantu, 80 percent of Cristal's high school youth can anticipate that some kind of external funding source will see them into and through a college education.

This proliferation of opportunity is hardly haphazard. It is part of a coordinated approach which transcends the boundaries of Cristal. If all the potential graduates were to remain in Cristal, the town would be supplied with far more qualified teachers and educational administrators than even the once-deprived Crystal City school system could absorb. But Cristal's leaders appear unconcerned about such an outcome, for they are interested in seeing their example replicated throughout Mexican-American southern Texas and would not object to exporting qualified Chicano educators to other Cristals around the circuit. On the other hand, it is too early to determine whether the lure of nearby big cities like San Antonio and Laredo (120 and 90 miles away, respectively) or the challenge of other, still more distant cities and universities might ultimately overcome the graduates' hometown loyalties. Either way, Cristal's leaders reason, the renown and influence of their remarkable system will inevitably flower.

The educational grand design for Cristal may be both realistic and attainable, but only with an enormous concentration of resources and energy. For their part, the 50 COP trainees quickly adjusted to long work hours, low pay, and inconvenient arrangements that might deter anyone not truly motivated to sign on for the duration. Only 10 have dropped out. There are no days off from work in the schools for university instruction, as is the case at most COP sites. Moreover, the awesome responsibility the aides bear as the outriders of an all-inclusive crash program of bilingual and bicultural instruction in Cristal places them in highly visible positions in the schools. They are rewarded with annual salaries ranging from $3,600 to $4,250 and the promise of a meager $6,000-$6,500 as 1st-year teachers for the 1975-76 school year.

The path to higher education is an all-but-deserted 2-lane road that slices through some of the Nation's more monotonous range land from Uvalde, 40 miles to the northwest, to Laredo, 90 miles to the southeast. With the 50 participants at almost 50 different stages of academic preparation, onsite instruction at Cristal by Southwest Texas Junior College and the Laredo campus of Texas A & I University no longer makes much sense. The only regular visitor from the world of higher education is Eduardo Hinojosa of Texas A & I, a one-time cowboy, migrant worker, and military policeman, who sensitively coordinates the "student teaching" phase of the COP experience every Monday in Cristal.

Alejandro Marquez, a COP participant, makes three roundtrip treks a week, two to Laredo and one to SWTC in Uvalde, and all three at night. Neither he nor his carpool members have ever seriously questioned the inconvenience involved in obtaining certification for what they already do. Already considered one of Cristal's outstanding teachers, with or without academic credentials, Marquez would be a star in any COP setting. His view of the role of higher education institutions in training teachers is respectful yet skeptical. Reiterating a viewpoint strongly held by participants throughout the COP network, Marquez asserts that the school classroom and not the university lecture hall is where teacher training should take place. Knowledge and process, he contends, are both more effectively communicated at the scene of the action than in any neutral or manufactured setting.

This COP-wide judgment, say the higher educators, is perfectly sensible as far as it goes. Many of the COP- connected, college-level institutions have taken extraordinary measures to respond to it. But virtually all emphasize, too, that prospective COP graduates are mature, purposeful students who would derive substantial benefits from the academy itself, emerging as better and more complete persons than when they matriculated. The two currents often flow past one another, all but oblivious of their need to merge. Not so, happily, in COP Cristal.

To Southwest Texas and Texas A & I, the Crystal City COP project has been an important vehicle for wedding these strains, both in COP and in a variety of other enterprises. In a fashion widely practiced in the COP world, these institutions have forced COP participants to spend time on the campus, while exporting instructors to the site for the field-based training to which the COP people respond so readily. On-campus time, says Texas A & I Dean Manuel Pacheco, is vital, both for the temporary immersion in academe and the use of college facilities, notably the library. The university "does as much as it can in Crystal City," but it does not subscribe in toto to the theory that full-time, onsite experience, begun in the freshman year, is the best or only way to orient future teachers. For the Laredo institution, which was only 5 years old in 1975 and whose undergraduate arm is exclusively "upper division" (junior-senior year), a better training track would include early exposure, while additionally involving the aspirant in a variety of experiences. And student teaching, practiced under close observation, strikes A & I as a perfectly legitimate activity. Far from granting automatic credit for the full-time classroom teaching of the COP participants, Texas A & I grants it only three student teaching credits and demands nine more in carefully controlled classroom settings away from the regular classroom of the COP paraprofessional. As far as A & I is concerned, this is a good arrangement; the understandably impatient COP aides are much less certain.

Like his colleagues in Laredo, Ismael Sosa, the COP coordinator at Southwest Texas Junior College, had his hands full with COP, which has provided a steady stream of GED-holders and their problems. Most had never been in a postsecondary school. The initial trick, revealed Sosa, was to find an academic area in which success could be guaranteed and a respectable academic level maintained. For a bilingual group, Spanish was a natural and speech a strong second choice. The ice melted quickly, mutual respect developed, and the paraprofessionals were on their way.

To Cristal COP, the SWTJC/A & I role is no more or less than that of COP's instructional subcontractors throughout the country: provide the services, give the degree, and get the COP aides licensed to teach. To their credit, neither institution willingly accepts this oversimplified depiction. Both recognize that involvement with Cristal COP almost automatically involves them deeply in Chicano and barrio society, and they are not reluctant to accept this involvement. They are markedly reluctant, however, to give excessive credit for dimly related, previous experience or to lower standards to accommodate inadequate performance. Nor will they promote one variety of social or cultural expression to the detriment or exclusion of others, and this may be more significant in the long run. Thus, through these kinds of creative tension, the integrity of the training process has been maintained, and every one touched by Cristal COP is the richer for it.

Chapter 7. The Unlikely Alliance: COP and Academe

One of the beauties of COP is that it blended so comfortably into the environments in which its important work was done—the school and the community. It neither threatened nor posed serious problems for either. Much of COP's credibility, in fact, derived from its readiness to reinforce and to join in larger collective efforts to improve both.

Despite the apparent compatibility of COP, the school, and the community, and the simplicity of the arrangements between them, relations with a final partner—the college—were more complex. Whatever the arrangement, the college was an external force, technically of the COP project but always physically and often psychologically far removed from it. To many colleges, the primary realities of the COP were the questions it raised concerning the college's collaboration with the project and its willingness to admit academically untested trainees. But to the schools, participants, and Washington managers, the functional relationship between the college and the program, while highly important as a supportive service, is less than primary for the program. If the college or university was to become part of the COP team, most of the project-level reasoning went, it would have to dismount from its high horse and accommodate new kinds of students with different educational needs.

Beyond quantifiable adjustments in admissions policy, sheltered courses, onsite instruction, work-study arrangements, student teaching, credit for life or practical experience, and others, what effect did COP have on the personality and purpose of its academic partners, the colleges and universities? Did they alter their attitudes? Do they have the same view of themselves that they held in 1970? Have they gained a new kind of public consciousness? What about sharing responsibility for the preparation of community teachers? Are they willing to maintain and expand the footholds gained by COP in the neighborhoods? Will they lend well-disposed ears to a community's pleas for expert help?

Generalizations in these areas are perilous. Take the large, progressive State university which, with a nudge from 5 years of Teacher Corps, a dynamic new dean, and a 10-year plan for inner-city teacher training almost ready, was on the verge of instituting onsite instruction and open admissions the day COP came along. What credit goes to COP? Or the tiny, liberal arts college that COP helped rescue from financial oblivion and which embraced the whole COP design. Even tougher, perhaps, what about the tradition-laden "name" school—there were a few in the COP chain—that admitted some COP people who were patently unqualified by its usual standards and exposed them, with little help, to the institution's uncompromisingly rigorous standards?

There is no such thing as a typical COP teacher training institution Its various manifestations have included the old, renamed normal school; the "State university branch campus at," as distinguished from the better established "university of" (but it could also be the latter); a heavily supported community college or a tottering, impoverished one; a college practicing competency-based education; a religious institution; a women's college; a men's college—anything, in fact, but West Point, Wellesley, and Harvard. While it can be said that COP gravitated to the locally oriented, usually unpretentious institution that would have some sense of what was called for, there were exceptions.

Many colleges and universities were, of course, superbly equipped and socially ready to meet the heavy demands of the early seventies, but many others had been content to stand pat. In 1967, the U.S. Office of Education commissioned the development of nine (later to become ten) elementary teacher training models. The commonalities were astonishing. In their separate styles, all reassessed the state of teacher training, and, in their reports of 1969, found it attuned to an America that no longer existed. At best, even granting it many innate strengths, teacher education was, as one architect of a model put it, ". . . in transition. . . moving from well-known past beliefs and practices to teacher preparation programs based on new concepts involving different educational approaches which are more consistent with social and educational change than previous, piecemeal efforts."

At no time did USOE anoint COP's universities as laboratories for the models, whose common content was emphasis on individualization, development of relevant competencies, increased guidance, far better management, major curricular change, and differentiated staffing, among others. Installing teacher education models was far beyond COP's charge. Besides, Teacher Corps, with most of its funds headed to the colleges, was willing and better situated to test many of the findings of the models, a task to which it devoted considerable energy in the 1969-72 period. The schools and communities knew what they wanted, said COP, and sellers were available in abundance. But in their understandable reverence for credentials and status, community members often were unaware of the irrelevant and unresponsive content of much of teacher education. To their credit, they created a national ruckus when they found out. The schools were only slightly more sensitive.

Principals who had received their degrees a generation earlier saw little cause to change what had gotten them by. School boards often didn't know the difference. With due respect, the intrinsic qualifications assumed to underly the paper credentials of new teachers could hardly have concerned them less.

The burden fell to the colleges and universities in the COP system. Most displayed a willingness to test the innovations suggested in the USOE models and, in so doing, to commit themselves to far-reaching and fundamental alterations in the ways they would train all kinds of teachers in the years ahead.

The brief accounts that follow spotlight some of the experiences encountered and attitudes developed at a cross-section of COP teacher training institutions. Several practices emerge as the norm: some consistent form of open admissions policy; varying degrees of onsite instruction; sheltered and core courses; and credit for on-the-job experience. Beyond these practices, the establishment of common factors or norms between projects becomes substantially more difficult. Whether a practice is rooted at superficial levels of individual predilection or local and institutional peculiarity—or on a generalized, more permanent one—becomes the primary question. But the evidence compels this observer of the Career Opportunities Program to conclude that, wherever the program has been, the marks of its passage are unmistakable and the degree of change it has brought about is remarkable.

Cumulative Evidence at Purdue-Hammond

In 1970, Purdue University's Calumet campus at Hammond, Ind. (population 107,800), was a conservative, commuter institution which catered to the educational needs of some 5,700 predominantly white, suburban, middle-class students. Its 500-odd Black students were scattered throughout the departments of the university, and minority faculty representation was, described charitably, trivial. The Education Department, with only 15 percent of the student body enrolled, was graduating about 120 new teachers a year. The college had a tough admissions policy and rigorous, largely inflexible course requirements and structures. It also levied surprisingly high tuition charges for a State university branch campus. And it had had only moderate experiences with the crazy-quilt world of Federal funding for education.

The appearance late in 1970 of 220 predominantly Black, older, often academically underprepared trainees from the neighboring Gary COP project jolted the institution. The top administrative level was receptive from the start, but the education faculty was initially skeptical of the ability of these nontraditional students to master complex course materials and to perform creditably as university students and ultimately as classroom teachers. But, as happened often throughout the

COP network, skepticism turned to admiration as the earnestness and application of the COP trainees overcame academic rustiness or inexperience.

To begin with, the group was large, even for a medium-sized university campus, and its members (95 percent Black, 3 percent Spanish-speaking, and 2 percent white) performed with distinction. Long before the project's termination, more than half had graduated, and the ultimate total was expected to exceed 165. Overall academic performance was above average, with the by-now customary revelation that many had been among the institution's outstanding recent graduates. Predictably again, once reserved faculty members were calling their experience with COP people "the most enriching" of their professional lives.

The COP effect on Purdue-Hammond has been a cumulative one. The many firsts accomplished by or through COP, under the extremely able leadership of Director Bennie Mae Collins, include a blend of administrative, academic, and attitudinal influences that have helped the college modify its ways and become a richer source of learning for all its students and the community. Open enrollment, previously an unimplemented policy, became an institutional reality. Many of the COP participants were initially enrolled in the community college division (a spinoff from Purdue-Hammond's General Studies Department), received remedial help through supportive services, and then transferred credits earned to the university proper. The policy now extends to the larger world beyond the COP program constituency as well, and the community college has thereby gotten itself into community affairs.

The Department of Education developed new courses, combined theory and methods from the first day of the COP trainee's academic experience, and, in an important deviation from local practice, faculty members observed aides in their classrooms as early as the first year. In other academic departments, the practice of bending rigid course requirements represented another less obvious but important shift induced under COP influence; an American history course, for example, weighted presentation to emphasize Black history. Similarly, despite the absence of courses specifically on urban studies, regular offerings in sociology and psychology were redesigned to focus on urban issues. Moreover, to accommodate the COP aides, the college adopted unconventional scheduling practices, combining the normal three-class-a-week cycle into single time blocks. It permitted COP to develop performance-based, one-credit workshops on such topics as assessing the child, food and nutrition, and transactional analysis. These are now available to all students, and some have even become academic requirements. In a pronounced departure from well-established practice, Purdue-Hammond offered half of the COP course load at the site, and whether the practice becomes permanent or not (legal technicalities may be inhibiting for a while) the habit is now ingrained.

And the student teaching requirement has undergone extensive change. As became the case with other enlightened, but initially reluctant, teacher training institutions, new ways of approaching this knotty issue were developed. The Purdue-Hammond contribution, formulated with and for COP Gary, was to spread practice teaching out over several months and integrate it with course and class work.

Gannon on the Move

Before COP, Gannon College in Erie, Pa., was a middle-class, Catholic, men's college which had just turned coeducational, with an enrollment of around 2,000. It had a strong Engineering Department and required all students to take 4 semesters of theology. By 1975, Gannon had dropped all admission requirements and was deeply committed to an urban education program. Along the way, it became a self-styled open university, permitting and even encouraging students whose jobs kept them from class to register, pick up course materials, and return at the end of the semester for final examinations. Did COP do this? The COP Erie and Gannon College answer: "It sure helped."

The COP project arrived on the Gannon campus in 1970 with 20, then 10 more, mostly Black, female participants. The 10 additional participants—the last to enter the program—were selected from 600 applicants and were therefore among the most qualified aides in the country. Gannon College had already entered the urban education arena in the late 1960s with an Upward Bound project a scholarship program for students from the embattled Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn, N.Y., and an outstanding evening program. It had also shown an interest in the community by beginning to develop an adult education program at the nearby prison. Relations with the local school system were improving, but they had not yet become genuinely collaborative. Within the college, courses were still lecture hall exercises and, although Gannon was not yet 25 years old, its academic procedures were apparently fixed.

The COP impact was not immediately evident. There was racial tension in the air, and not all faculty members were sold on making degree-holding teachers of low income community residents. But the collective performance of the COP paraprofessionals converted the nonbelievers and, as witnesses in Erie would attest, persuaded Gannon to identify itself fully and creatively with the urban climate in which it existed.

Credit for Gannon's open admissions policy is freely accorded to COP. After 1 year, the college was convinced of the potential of COP-type students, and the policy was adopted. The usual COP practicum seminar has been incorporated into the regular education curriculum. Student teaching became an integrated experience performed as early as the 2d year, to be followed up and refined later in the COP participant's cycle. And for the first time, there are few barriers between school and college, a situation created through the applied efforts of the entire COP team. The ultimate evidence of Gannon's "liberation": a COP participant commuted to Gannon throughout a 90-day prison sentence. If it didn't bother the prison, it didn't bother Gannon. And, to round out this brief sketch of COP Erie, there was a perfect 4.0 grade point average-achiever. She was 50 years old.

Going Native in Alaska

Geography and logistics were such dominant factors in the creation of a federally funded, teacher training enterprise in Alaska that two programs, COP and Teacher Corps, joined forces to create a single administrative unit. The combined endeavor, known as the Alaska Rural Teacher Training Corps (ARTTC) and served by the only two universities in the State, the University of Alaska and Alaska Methodist,* revolutionized teacher training there.

Because the participants (called "interns") are largely concentrated in 10 villages as distant as 1,500 miles from the University of Alaska campus at Fairbanks, the university comes to them. And in a reversal of the usual COP model, participants spend the bulk of their time in sorely needed academic work, with but 3 hours or less spent daily in the village schools. Together, ARTTC and the university developed a new, interdisciplinary teacher education curriculum leading to a B.A. in cross-cultural education. Emphasizing Native American studies in an anthropological context, the program is field-based, with instruction offered by six highly qualified, specially hired faculty members who develop their own courses. The six were not hired, however, until they received the approval of local community representatives. The design has attracted State-level attention, and $2 million may be made available for it after ARTTC ends.

Of 44 graduates of the program, 33 are Native American, either Eskimo or Indian. Before the COP cycle finished, 36 of the 44 were teaching in Alaska's rural school system. This is especially significant in light of the fact that in 1971 there were only 7 Native American teachers in all of Alaska, whereas in 1974 alone, 30 Native American ARTTC graduates entered the school system as teachers. In the spring of 1975, the 32 undergraduates were working in 20 villages.

Teachers mean a great deal to Alaskan society. Good ones are crucial. Excellent Eskimo and Indian teachers are pure gold. The University of Alaska, with a pivotally important assist from ARTTC, is mining that gold.

---

*Alaska Methodist was scheduled to close in 1975; it was to be partially absorbed by the University of Alaska. It will not be discussed here beyond mention that it was responsive to COP's needs despite the fact that it did not feature teacher training.

Pasadena City College: Trainer of Paraprofessionals

Pasadena City College has a student body of 19,000 which, to quote President Armen Sarafian, is "a cross-section of America, representing all ages, incomes, abilities, and ethnic groups." A pioneer in the 2-year community college movement, Pasadena was established in 1924, long before 2-year colleges became a regular feature of the educational landscape. It offers paraprofessional-level associate degrees in arts and sciences, with such specialities as nursing, electronics, law enforcement, and business, among dozens of others. Although aspiring teachers of all ages had previously begun their college training there before moving on to 4-year institutions, PCC had never devoted particular attention to education paraprofessionals. Now it does.

The Pasadena COP project numbers 170 aides, of whom roughly 115 are Mexican-American. The average age is over 40. Unlike most COP groups, most of the Pasadena contingent are not headed for 4-year degrees and licensing as teachers but are interested in becoming better teacher aides and improving their position in the schools. The project is distinctive in having identified itself with these purposes, and Pasadena City College helped to provide both the organizational impetus and academic content necessary to achieve them.

The regularization of paraprofessional-level preparation in Pasadena has been a two-stage process. Resentful at being left out of the processes of school governance, excluded even from using the teachers' lounges, most paraprofessionals realized that their lot was bound to remain static until they could earn a more substantial degree of professional respect. Fortunately for the professional advancement and self-improvement of the aides, COP and Pasadena City College entered the picture with the objective of developing clearly defined job criteria through a well-formulated progression of training experiences. Already closely tied to the theory and practice of paraprofessionalism in many fields, PCC welcomed COP as the vehicle through which it could put together a comprehensive effort for public school teacher aides. It created an "intermediate certificate" level reachable after 20 to 28 PCC credits, eight earned by onsite work and the remainder in class. It worked with COP and the Pasadena school system to design and install a career ladder. Both to underline its commitment and because the actions made sense, PCC went several steps further: it conducted an active campaign to recruit and register likely candidates off-campus; generated site-based classes open to COP participants, community residents, and anyone else interested in the subject; and made extensive revisions in the outdated teacher aide curriculum. In the process, COP almost literally forced a new level of interdisciplinary cooperation on the college. Expanding far beyond the Social Science Department, which had borne the brunt of instructional responsibility for teacher aides, COP drafted the English, Art, and Communications Departments and persuaded the language faculty to create a course in Spanish for non-Spanish-speaking COP aides. It was quickly oversubscribed. En route to these local milestones, COP Director Gwendolyn Keller became a PCC assistant professor, and relations between school and college solidified, with each developing new respect for the other.

The COP Pasadena model, as it evolved, was one of a kind. It is probable that no other project had so few participants—possibly no more than 5 percent—go on to 4-year degrees. Yet it may have triggered changes with national implications for paraprofessionalism. And the widely underrated 2 year college demonstrated in COP Pasadena that it could not only run a credible program but that it could influence large systems.

A New Deal at Pikeville

It would be neat to characterize COP at Pikeville College, Pikeville, Ky., in one sentence: the COP assistant director became acting president of the college. But while this was an indisputable first, the Pikeville story, including its 200 participants, can't be summed up so simply.

In 1970, Pikeville College was a quiet, 71-year-old, church-affiliated college in Kentucky's easternmost tip. With its 600 full-time and 200 part-time students, over half of them destined to teach in nearby schools, it was then and remains today a significant social and economic force in the affairs of Pikeville (population 6,000) and surrounding Pike County (population 70,000). The State's per capita income of $2,847 in 1969 was luxurious compared with Pikeville's $1,770. But the little college was not about to lower standards that had survived through thick and thin. At $1,000, its tuition was high for the area, and the year before COP Pikeville began, enrollment was limited to students graduating in the top 25 percent of their high school classes.

Then along came COP, a challenge to any higher education institution, but a particularly stiff one to Pikeville College, the community's only teacher training institution. After a gulp or two, however, the college decided to buy in, and once committed, it simply came to accept as normal new ways of doing old things that only a few years earlier would have been unthinkable. The following are highlights of COP Pikeville's accomplishments:

- A traditional teacher training program became an innovative one, complete with individually tailored programs, unconventional sequences, the beginnings of competency-based instruction, early classroom experience for trainees, and, the most difficult hurdle, credit for practical experience.
- The project got the State student teaching requirement waived, and COP aides received one credit per semester for 4 years for the classroom work they were doing most of the day.

- The Pikeville faculty moved into the community, relating theory to practice by teaching onsite courses. Skeptical at first of the new breed of students, they were gradually converted into believers by the tenacity and competence of the paraprofessionals. (A mother of five, herself one of 21 children, registered a 4.0 grade point average.)

With relatively minor trimming and shaping, this was the stuff of which an ideal COP college role was formed. Whether Pikeville College was ready for what took place there from 1970 to 1975, or willing, it made a careful decision, based on weighty evidence, to stick with it. The result was a heavy commitment to new clients, new forms, and, without compromising its academic reputation, new educational values.

Brigham Young Measures Up

To spend a day at the off-campus center of Brigham Young University in Blanding, Utah, is to be transported back to an era in which students were forbidden to smoke, drink, or dance; dress and hair codes were only slightly less restrictive than those of West Point; and moral values were uncompromising and deeply religious. These were the qualities demanded by the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Mormons) of their showpiece university.

There is no reason to believe that the Mormon elders, many of them in their eighties and nineties, have been less than pleased with what has happened at this 100-year-old institution, now one of the country's largest private universities. It is an academically sound establishment, with 13 colleges, a law school on the horizon, and a good-to-excellent across-the-board rating. The physical plant is handsome and richly endowed. Many Brigham Young alumni have already spread the Mormon word as missionaries around the world.

Why COP at Brigham Young? "Why not?" asked the administrators of its 3,000-student College of Education. The result: a strong, creative university role in a 120-participant project (80 American Indians, 2 Spanish-speaking, the rest whites) with unique needs and insistent demands. The impact on the institution of its experience includes:

- relaxed admissions criteria for COP trainees;
- introduction of American Indian history and linguistics, both featured in the COP sequence, into regular university curriculums;
- credit for off-campus courses;
- an onsite teaching arrangement in which university faculty and five school staff members gave COP classes on alternate weeks;

- student teaching credit for regular aide-level classroom work observed by university supervisors for 8 weeks; and
- field-based graduate programs in administration and in guidance and counseling, generated by some of COP's first 20 graduates.

The list could continue. What this and the other projects described here show is that COP's universities did not just span the gamut of American higher education; they undertook serious new commitments. Brigham Young could have lived without COP's Federal money, but like so many others on the COP circuit, it saw COP as an opportunity to expand professional horizons, render services, and demonstrate a practical willingness to examine its entrenched ways of doing things.

Some Urban Selections

At their best, the COP teacher training institutions used the experience to examine whether and how to reorient their own purposes and practices. At their worst, they gave COP exactly what it paid for: academic instruction qualifying teacher aides to become licensed teachers. Those that took the full plunge may never again train teachers as they did in 1969. Others found themselves at a kind of ideological crossroads, unsure of their direction and unwilling to decide. And to still others, COP was a large, intrusive presence that flushed out a dormant institutional conscience. For most, perhaps 200 of COP's 270-plus postsecondary affiliates, the COP years were, at the least, jarring to the system.

It was no mean achievement for COP to bring change to Bishop State (Ala.), Tennessee Tech, or Southwestern Louisiana. And COP can lay claim to having put Humboldt University of Arcata, Calif., into the business of educating Native Americans on a scale never before achieved in the State. In their different ways, Gannon, Shepherd, and Pikeville all used COP to build new approaches to training teachers. These institutions received COP as a relatively new kind of responsibility, one that had begun to assert itself only in the very recent past: that of adjusting their procedures and outlooks to the needs of people who would henceforth be joining and perhaps competing with the regular flow of college-age, middle-class, teacher trainees. But what about the urban establishments that had already produced generations of inner-city schoolteachers? Did they regard COP as a challenge to the order they had established? Did they view it as a new force bent on destroying comfortable connections with the city school systems they had supplied with teachers for so long?

Some, like the massive, multicampus City University of New York, had little interest (although two of its institutions trained some COP aides) not because they underestimated the problems but because they were already overcommitted to programs like COP and to the clients served by them. Some simply couldn't see getting into still another demanding "operation bootstrap." And some had substantial worries about maintaining traditional academic standards, which they sensed had already dipped below tolerable levels. But to those who decided to enter the fold, the 5-year COP cycle was a well-timed opportunity to broaden institutional viewpoints and, in the process, to institute overdue reforms that had been neglected in the turmoil of the sixties.

Five institutions, all situated in or near large but not Gargantuan cities, mirror the issues with which COP dealt. They are: Miami of Ohio, the Universities of Cincinnati and Louisville, Harris Teachers' College, and Webster College, both in St. Louis.

Each of the five faced the issue of admissions in different ways. At the 10,000-student University of Louisville, COP's 125 participants were instrumental in the adoption of an almost open admissions policy which credits maturity, personal background, and work experience. Even non-high school graduates may be provisionally accepted and given a trial semester in which to achieve unconditional admission. The University of Cincinnati eased many of its COP participants in through the device of its new 2-year University College, without having to face the issue of open admissions. Harris Teachers' College in St. Louis gave "life experience" credit for what COP aides did before they became paraprofessionals and proceeded to make this a collegewide policy. Webster College had already instituted open admissions.

Formerly a Catholic women's college featuring music, fine arts, and drama, the 1,500-student Webster had become one of the country's most stimulating and innovative, coeducational urban colleges in the 1960s. By the time COP arrived, Webster's perception of itself and its public image had both undergone nearly complete transformations. Much still needed to be done, however, in the area of teacher training, which by 1975 was attracting one-third of Webster's students. And here the college had to make draconic adjustments. Starting with 40 returned Vietnam-era veterans who entered COP en masse from a "veterans in education" project already under way at Webster, the college instituted some of the by-now customary run of COP-inspired practices, taking particular pride in its ability to provide early classroom experience for participants.

Most of the 300-plus aides involved in COP St. Louis took their academic work at Harris, an inner-city institution of 1,500-2,000 students that had been only tangentially concerned with the affairs of the community in which it was situated. Due to Harris' educational conservatism, each step taken by COP was hard fought. Onsite instruction was initially unpopular but took hold gradually, although never in a completely successful way. As at Webster, it took 2 years and a rough struggle to relax and finally eliminate the formal student teaching requirement, but it happened. Sheltered courses eventually became part of the curriculum in both colleges. Reluctantly, the two colleges allowed COP classroom teachers to offer these courses. The sentiment in St. Louis is that the overall effect created by COP will be lasting at both institutions.

When COP came to Cincinnati in 1970, the 150-year-old, city-supported University of Cincinnati, which dominates the city's higher educational scene, chose to sit it out. The project went instead to Miami University, a 13,000-student State university 40 miles away in Oxford. The arrangement made little sense, and in 1972 the new superintendent, Donald Waldrip, and the new University of Cincinnati president, Warren Bennis, agreed that improved school-university relations were necessary across a broad front. Re-enter the University of Cincinnati. But the bulk of the participants were too deeply into their Miami training to break off without serious dislocation. Miami, with a strong commitment to site-based instruction but a strange insistence that the junior year be spent on campus on a full-time basis, thus remained an "urban" teacher training institution throughout the life of the project. For its part, Cincinnati tried to emulate some of the more successful COP teacher training institutions, but, despite its reputable faculty and 19,000 students (or maybe because of them) the going was rough. It designed a 2-year program for paraprofessionals which terminates with an associate degree and a certificate attesting that the successful aide has become an educational technologist. Field-based instruction has become almost *de rigueur*, but the School of Education is less than enchanted with its role in the whole COP affair, and its main emphasis seems to have settled into the more manageable task of training aides to be better aides.

More typical of COP's urban, higher education affiliations is the University of Louisville, which graduated 90 of the 125-odd participants by the end of the project. Neither the university nor the COP Louisville project makes extravagant claims of lasting institutional change achieved as a result of COP. Indeed, the university had already gained wide experience with Federal teacher training programs and had developed its own well-tested approaches to speeding the upward mobility of aspiring minority and low-income teacher candidates. One is left to decide whether it was enough that the COP experience led to open admissions, the development of a few new courses, and the acceptance of early classroom experience for education majors.

* * *

The COP alliance with academe transcended the concerns and brief descriptions offered above. It took additional forms and, in two notable cases, served people with exceptional needs in circumstances radically different from the COP norm. The two—the Graduate Career Opportunities Program (GCOP) at Rutgers University and the doctoral-level program for Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Education (IESE) of the Union Graduate School of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities—represent COP's foray into the world of graduate education. Their participants were not teacher aides, and their image was, to understate the case, markedly unconventional.

The GCOP idea was sparked by Dr. Samuel DeWitt Proctor, who has filled the following roles, among others: former president of two Black colleges, one-time Peace Corps and OEO official, and, more recently, Martin Luther King, Jr., Professor at the Rutgers Graduate School of Education. The GCOP effort was a master's degree-granting program targeted at mature but uncredentialed individuals who, for various reasons, had dropped out of college; it aimed, with carefully constructed graduate curriculums, to train these individuals as "action researchers" able eventually to assist COP projects in self-adjustment and self-evaluation. By early 1975, 34 such persons had earned their master's degrees (and 14 of them had also been accepted into doctoral programs at Rutgers) with 20 more expected to do so by the mid-1975 termination of the program.

Although the notion of training COP evaluators failed to survive, GCOP produced certified social studies educators, of whom 18 were in school administrative posts in early 1975. And yet all began their GCOP experience under conditions that hardly presaged such success. Their previous academic exposure had been spotty and poorly planned. They faced an uncertain welcome at prestigious Rutgers. With an age range of 24 to 59, many had lost whatever study discipline they may once have achieved. And the quest for academic achievement was further complicated for each of them by the fight to survive on stipends that never exceeded $5,200 a year. With work internships and a helpful GCOP administration, however, all but a few managed to cope.

The GCOP effort did not lead to the abolition of all admission requirements in Rutgers' graduate programs. Nor did the solid academic records of its mostly Black (34 of the first 41) student group convince very many that all minority college dropouts should plunge into graduate school environments. But for its part, Rutgers is willing to continue to make exceptions for GCOP-type applicants, and perhaps the message will spread. The program may have important implications for graduate education. At the least, GCOP has demonstrated—or perhaps just reiterated—that there are few limits to what an intelligent, tenacious person can achieve.

The IESE doctoral program of the Union Graduate School was a kind of culmination of COP's efforts. It was directed mainly at COP directors, who were themselves the products, perhaps a half-generation earlier, of the same kinds of struggles the COP participants underwent from 1970 to 1975. Sensitized by the deprivations of their earlier years but ready to flower in the enlightened 1960s, many COP directors were able to instill in the COP trainees some of the qualities that had propelled them into responsible positions in educational administration. When it worked, the process was synergistic and mutually reinforcing.

But completion of the process would have left some COP directors professionally high and dry. Five years of COP had been a heady experience, and the prospect of reverting to less stimulating milieux, offering no immediate opportunities for further personal and professional growth, would not have been especially attractive. It would also have made bad sense, for the termination of COP would ordinarily have meant short-circuiting the career ambitions of some of the better minority educators in the business.

The problem was anticipated, however, and in 1973 USOE commissioned the New Careers Training Laboratory to develop a doctoral program for COP directors. Designed to stimulate the flow of minority individuals and women into the senior administrative posts from which they have traditionally been excluded, the IESE program needed a university that would neither impose unmeetable residency requirements nor bind students to tightly patterned curriculums, and yet would offer credit for experience and innovative projects. Most universities found these criteria too demanding. Not so, however, for the highly innovative Union Graduate School of the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities in Yellow Springs, Ohio, a consortium of 33 institutions where Ph.D. candidates develop their own programs in cooperation with a committee of their peers and selected faculty members from consortium member schools. After 2 or 3 years of supervised work and study, and the successful completion of a "Project Demonstrating Excellence," the Ph.D. is granted.

The first IESE group of 20 included 13 COP directors—three Black men, seven Black women, and three white men. Their projects focus on COP, heavily emphasizing COP's impact on their own school systems. Thus, if the IESE effort succeeds, the COP experiences will presumably be enhanced by new insights, the directors will have achieved new levels of academic and professional standing, and our educational leadership will have been enriched, in the persons of the graduates, by an overdue accession of a rare combination of virtues—administrative experience, minority backgrounds, and scholarly credentials.

Chapter 8. An Interim Summing Up

At the Political Crossroads

Conceived in the 1960s, the Career Opportunities Program lived its life in the 1970s. And the climate of that decade was far different than the earlier. First, a senior congressional staff member addressing a conference of educators and politicians in March 1975, said:

> Go back 10 years, and education was all over Congress. Even 6 or 7 years ago. Now, a Member can go weeks without having to display the slightest interest. There are few pressures and no issues of educational consequence on Capitol Hill. A Federal role has been accepted, but the only real sticking points concern how it's to be carried out. Even the "education" Senators and Congressmen, the very few with serious, lasting concern, are almost totally preoccupied with the tax bill, Indochina, and the economy. If three Congressmen show up at their own education subcommittee's hearing, it's a gala occasion. Those that do come often stay for only the few minutes necessary to get a major point across.

The director of a Black Studies Center asserted in the March 1975 issue of a national educational journal:

> Many have failed to notice that there has been a change in the tenor of the times. Interest in the black cause has diminished as liberals turn to new battles such as the Equal Rights Amendment, the energy crisis, the Indian Movement, and other causes. This change has been heralded by passage of an Ethnic Heritage Studies Act by Congress, designed to create more interest in 'white studies.'
>
> After a record black college enrollment in 1972, the '73 figures show a significant decline in college enrollments for blacks. At the core of our hopes for a pluralistic society has been an educated populace. From the "Talented Tenth" of DuBois to the Street Academies of Philadelphia, education has been our trump card. If this erosion of confidence among blacks in the education process continues, there is reason to believe that more and more black students will shorten their education careers.

Finally, a high-level Federal education functionary had these thoughts on COP itself:

> It was still possible in 1969 and 1970 to harness some responsible minority energies for the likes of a COP program. And, in its own fashion, COP started out as a refreshingly antibureaucratic exercise. But even then our national interest in education was beginning to slip, a trend the Nixon Administration was pleased to encourage. A perfectly good arrangement like COP simply needed much more push than it got. It just wasn't in the American educational power structure. Its rhetoric was quickly outdated. And when the Office of Education itself lost interest in what was to have been the jewel in the EPDA crown, there was no chance that it would ever occupy center stage anywhere. Whatever its

> merits, which may have been many, it became one of the tiresome chain of so-so Federal education programs playing out the string. It probably deserved much better. The idea, taken *in vacuo*, was a pretty good one, but no idea is destined to make a difference without leadership, timing, and personal investment by people and institutions who believe in it.

The charge that COP was an ill-timed attempt to meet demands that were rapidly losing force during its lifetime may best be answered by reference to the political context into which it was born. True, the outward militance of minority—mainly Black—activism had crested, although much would still be heard, throughout COP's span, from Chicano, Native American, and the Black community as well. Perhaps more telling, majority group activism on behalf of poor and minority Americans was ebbing at a rate to cause concern. This turnabout in the national political mood heralded a debunking of the social programs of the sixties as boondoggling failures. Poor people began to be labeled "welfare chiselers." It was even attested that some minority groups considered a promising source of potential votes had been granted Federal aid on that basis, but that when their political sentiments had changed direction, the aid had been diverted. And so it all seemed to be going in the early 1970s.

But in fact, all was not lost. The activism of the sixties had best served its purpose by giving way to deeds, whether single-shot infusions of resources or, as in the case of COP, limited but achievable mobilizations aimed at specific people, professions, and institutions. And even while introducing new people to new careers, COP epitomized the changed ambience of the 1970s. First, it was an incarnation of the old-fashioned work ethic. No Federal handout, it may have been the only program to demand 12- to 16-hour workdays for poverty-level wages. Not only didn't it attack the prevailing political and economic system, its participants were ambitious to become part of it. The program was unabashedly centered on upward mobility, but only for those meeting high standards of accomplishment. It gave poor people decisive responsibility for their own affairs, but only if they worked for it. And accountability for performance was played out on a two-way street, for the schools had an important role and responsibility in the quality and the outcome of the practical training the aides received inside their walls. Building principals and school superintendents could not claim to have been misled. When they hired a COP graduate as a professional teacher, they knew exactly what they were getting.

Demonstration or Large Slice?

COP was just the right size for a demonstration project. It was not Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with its billions of dollars, thousands of schools, and millions of children, nor was it a small network of tightly governed pilot models. It was large enough to yield important information within well-defined boundaries but not so large that it could not maintain its own collective identity. With $121 million for its 5 "core years" ($129 million for the full 7 years in which there was an actual COP presence), and some 14,000 participants, COP represented an important but hardly overwhelming commitment to an approach that combines work and study in the training of neighborhood-based paraprofessionals to become teachers in low-income area schools.

Yet the fact that they were running a demonstration did not stop COP's designers and managers from trying to meet actual needs on something like the scale on which they existed.

The COP aides were a truly significant percentage of the teacher aides in low-income classrooms, especially of paraprofessionals working in instructional capacities—as distinguished from those employed full-time as hall monitors, record keepers, or supply clerks. They may even have numbered an actual majority of those aides actively pursuing degrees and teaching licenses. Moreover, with regard to minority group representation in teacher training, COP had distinguishable impact. In 1972, according to data from the Educational Testing Service and the American Association of School Administrators, roughly 700,000 undergraduates intended to become teachers. Of these, approximately 10 percent, or 70,000, were from American minority populations. At that time, some 9,300 COP aides had similar intentions and were enrolled in teaching degree programs. Of these, about 6,800 were nonwhite. Assuming that these data are reasonably accurate, COP participants may have comprised, on a national basis, up to 10 percent of the minority aspirants in teacher training at this near midpoint in the program's life.

This leads us to the following formulation: Given that, the traditional underrepresentation of minorities in the national teaching force (approximately 12.2 percent in 1972) badly needed correcting in the late 1960s and early 1970s, why should one of the more impressive programs aimed at righting the situation not have been continued, at least until a proper balance had been achieved? There is no simple answer, but these were some of the likely contributing factors: a rapidly evolving national undertaking to remove the Federal government from direct involvement in such matters, bureaucratic expediency, a one-dimensional interpretation of labor power statistics in the teaching field, publicity, budget cutting, and, the USOE decision to maintain rather than expand the program. At the root of the "demonstration vs. large slice" issue is the question of whether and in what forms the government should involve itself in teacher training. If usage establishes practice, then there is no doubt of the legitimacy of some sort of Federal role. As Chapter 1 shows, teacher training—whether through institutes under the National Defense Education Act or under COP's authorization, EPDA, or any other device—has become an accepted area for Federal intervention.

But on what scale and to what ends? When EPDA was signed in 1967, it was intended primarily to meet acute shortages of educational personnel, and the applicable measure in this instance of Federal action was quantitative. Although an improvement in the quality of teacher training did not go unmentioned as an important goal of the legislation, it was quite definitely a secondary consideration that would not have commanded the necessary votes to become law on its own. Considerations of quantity, on the other hand, were relatively unimportant to COP's creators, who felt they had other, more important agenda items to pursue. While meeting EPDA's criteria, the new COP program was seen as a means to achieve several goals. It was meant to help ease the strains of poverty. It was to promote new careers. The assignment of primary training responsibility to the public school was to be a major COP undertaking, as was the full regularization of educational paraprofessionalism.

As it happened, a debate on the question of the appropriate Federal stance with respect to the quantitative and qualitative goals of the program never materialized within the organization. The ultimate outside force in matters of political and administrative philosophy, the national political administration, intervened. To quote a recent Commissioner of Education:

> This Office gathers statistics. It assesses national needs and makes recommendations as to how these may be met. It is a trouble-shooter. If it has a guiding philosophy, it is to preserve our traditional and legal national respect for the primacy of the State in educational matters. We believe, too, that our direct support of program activities should be at the level of exemplary or demonstration projects, not massive responses, unless, of course, the Congress demands them. And we want to shift much of our administrative authority out to the 10 HEW/USOE regions.

It was around the last two points—exemplary projects and decentralization—that the Federal managerial approach to COP came ultimately to crystallize and against which it must be analyzed. COP's overworked Washington staff would have asserted that COP was created both to *serve* deserving clients and to *demonstrate* the ways in which COP-type objectives could be attained. And the assignment of demonstration status to COP's 132 projects would not have presented either a practical or a theoretical problem of very much interest to its headquarters management staff. Whether they would have perceived that the COP program was in effect a series of overlapping, intersecting pilot models requiring identification as to characteristics and potential is questionable. As the illustrative descriptions in earlier chapters have attempted to illuminate, all projects had certain common ingredients and qualities which were put there by design and administrative fiat. But, mostly unintentionally, COP also constructed other models, which yielded serendipitous learnings outside COP's own stated goals. Each model warranted unique kinds of monitoring and assessment. One method, for example, could have been to group the Native American projects, or the bilingual, or the rural, and to develop consolidated group criteria for monitoring and assessment to refine the universally applied national standards. A second might have focused on the implications of the several arrangements in which postsecondary institutions, rather than the school systems, were the COP grantees. Still other cuts could have been based on the several different styles of teacher training (traditional, field-based, competency-based) used by postsecondary institutions in the COP network, or based on the various models of community advisory organs. For reasons rooted in the nature of COP's information-gathering and evaluative methods, none of these demonstration criteria were applied, and the misleading vision of a single, monolithic COP model persisted.

As an Educational Force

At about the time COP was established, another Federal education program was being closely examined to establish how the way it functioned was helping it to achieve its objectives. This was called a process evaluation. In setting it up, the evaluators solicited a statement of the program's core objectives against which discrepancies could be isolated and measured. Communication was difficult. The Federal agency claimed to want the evaluation, but it also maintained that its program's objectives were dynamic, in a state of perpetual flux reflecting changes in the society and education. In the resulting absence of fixed criteria, the assessment that eventuated pleased no one. In setting its theoretical bounds too wide, the agency had given the evaluators no choice but to judge the program on the basis of its managers' current perceptions of the educational universe. Those, to be kind, had little to do with the exact state of the worthy program they were administering.

Fortunately for COP, the things it wanted and stood for—its objectives—were always clear and, in important respects, attainable. But in an era of great upheavals in public education, COP was less than decisive in its view of the educational system and its role in it. Some days, especially early in the game, its Federal leaders seemed to want to turn the schools upside down or scrap them and start fresh; it appeared at times that they would probably not have lodged any truly insuperable objection to using COP as a device for scuttling the teacher training establishment entire. Most of the time, though, the program manifestly preferred gradual improvement from within to change that could, after all, jeopardize hard-won gains for teacher aides. If, in the final analysis, COP lacked a "change strategy," this resulted from a tacit understanding that it would concentrate on improving and enriching the learning and teaching process rather than transforming the system that presently constituted a stable matrix for it.

The stress, it must be emphasized, was on COP's people, rather than on system-shattering designs. In fact, of course, COP teacher aides were useful instruments in many different strategies aimed at improving school performance. For example, the various designs for training whole school staffs would have been incomplete without aides. And the better qualified the aide, the greater the chance of success of the particular innovation, whether portal, or multiunit school, or open classrooms. The COP members of an instructional team were almost invariably a stronger force than regular aides, for two reasons: They had often been selected in a competitive process, and they were professionally upwardly mobile on the career ladder/lattice that was part of the COP pattern.

In the ghettoes, barrios, reservations, and rural school districts, where a growing sense of community and ethnic identity had revealed itself as an important force for reform in the 1960s, COP played a role out of all proportion to its relatively small size. The role was institutional, educational, and intensely human. Moreover, it was quintessentially participatory where participation mattered most: in the classroom. If the local school system respected the COP model, as most did, the COP aide was halfway to becoming a full-fledged member of the school's professional staff and worked in a predominantly instructional capacity. Above all, she was the Chicano or Black woman with children, a vested interest in the neighborhood schools, and, more often than not, the capacity to show poor children that they, too, could travel the route she was now on. Or do even better.

This only begins to address the difference COP made in public schools. No single factor, but rather an amalgam of forces, emerges as the central COP contribution. COP was not solely a fulcrum for community action, charged to advise the public school hierarchy, or even to share decisionmaking authority with it. Nor was it just the physical presence of a COP aide in a Detroit or Navajo reservation classroom. The binding element was training. Closely linked was cultural and group identity. And for these, no amount of structural innovation—however valuable to the COP process were open classrooms, modular instruction, role differentiation, or any other—could provide an adequate substitute. As long as the basic conditions cited were met, the COP formula was flexible and left the weighing of the mix largely to the sensitive discretion of site administration.

Toward the end of the 5-year cycle, certain other broad educational implications of COP began to make themselves felt in the areas of adult education, teacher training, and postsecondary institutions generally, among others.

Late in COP's cycle, in the 1974-1975 school year, the New Careers Training Laboratory undertook a multidimensional assessment of the jewels in COP's crown: the COP graduates who had already begun to teach. The study used a variety of instruments both to judge the performance of the 1st-year COP teachers and to compare it, in the same school buildings and grades at 15 sites across the country, to that of a matched group of 1st-year, non-COP-trained teachers. The 15 were selected as a stratified sample of the 132 COP projects.

Covering personal characteristics, attitudes, classroom behavior, and impact on pupils, the data fell into a consistent pattern. The Career Opportunities Program-trained teachers were more likely to have a more positive attitude toward teaching, be more socially oriented, have more vigor, be more original in thought, and receive a higher rating from the principal based on their work in the classroom. They were more supportive of student-initiated talk and less likely to ask questions soliciting rote responses. The children taught by the COP-trained teacher had a more positive self-concept, had parents with more positive attitudes toward school, and performed better on standardized achievement tests. Although many of the differences between the COP-trained and non-COP-trained teachers are small, the pattern of differences is clear and consistent.

When the observer of COP turns to its meaning for career and recurrent education, it becomes apparent that COP reinforced the growing body of information concerning the usefulness of formal professional education at every stage in life. It also provided a comprehensive design—a community-based, adult, work-study approach for nontraditional students—with significant implications for training programs in and out of the education professions.

COP showed that successful collaboration between 2-year and 4-year colleges requires that both parties realistically assess their complementary strengths so that the participant receives an integrated educational experience. The community colleges (COP was affiliated with 61 of them) were less prepared for training teachers than the 4-year institutions, but they were ready—this was their real COP job—to equip COP paraprofessionals for the more rigorous academic work they would later encounter. It remains to be seen whether, as a result of COP, an appreciable number of 2-year institutions continue to devise curriculums for training and eventually certifying paraprofessionals in education. Over time, various *ad hoc* collaborations and consortia (Nashville and Baltimore are good examples) were formed among colleges in the COP network, to the benefit of all of the institutions involved.

Although most of COP's 4-year colleges had already tried field-based instruction prior to COP, only a tiny fraction had done so on a sustained basis, complete with new courses and totally different kinds of students. If they were occasionally slow to embrace arrangements in which they were not the senior partners, they were neither condescending nor preachy once they came on to the local school scene. Some, however, remained underinformed and did little to close the information gap. To their credit, however, few regarded their involvement in COP neighborhoods as an isolated laboratory experience. It was the real world, and they became part of it, probably irrevocably.

The question arises: Will the 211 four-year colleges in COP continue the flexible- or open-admissions arrangements for future nontraditional applicants that many adopted for COP trainees? The national movement toward open admissions had already acquired steam when COP began, and the 2-year institutions were, by the terms of their charters, almost uniformly committed to it. COP tested the developing policy by negotiating the admission of students underprepared by traditional standards. Some of them had had less than a high school education and had not been students for 25 years. Once admitted, they performed more than adequately.

The principle of granting credit for life and practicum experiences was rejected outright by certain institutions, while others would consider only those offerings that met the stiffest of requirements. The "core practicum," or "COP field seminar," since it had been designed or at least approved by the training institution, usually posed no problem.

Finally, what about COP's design for training indigenous aides to become highly qualified, sensitive, licensed teachers? Is it the only way? Is it the best way? A simple answer will suffice: It is an effective way. Herewith are some of the main virtues.

The COP training model was generally shaped to the practical needs and demands of its participants. Full-time campus life was neither desirable nor suitable for these adult students who had to contribute to or were the sole support of a family. The COP design was ultimately an enlightened work-study approach to adult learning and professional advancement. The combination of conveniently arranged (for the most part) college work, paid employment, achievable goals, and a sense of meeting local and even general social needs was a stimulating mix.

Early introduction to and immersion in the teacher situation was a quick and natural method of career selection. There were some aides for whom the management of an entire class was a nightmare. They learned this early, and their choices—to become good aides but to forget about teaching, or perhaps to leave education altogether—could be made before their investments had become irretrievable. Those who took to teaching were spared the usual confusion about career choice.

For teacher aspirant and permanent paraprofessional alike, the career lattice was a source of personal security and an assurance of an orderly career in public education. The combination of lattice and ladder was ideal for individuals with professional aspirations who needs must continue to be concerned on a day to day basis with their existing careers. The lattice was a powerful device in itself for strengthening the legitimacy of paraprofessionalism in education.

The COP decided preference for indigenous participants, as against the outsiders who had traditionally staffed inner-city or other low-income schools, made for internal accountability. The aides' own children or their neighbors' children were often in those schools, and, as neighborhood people, they knew and were part of the scene in which they lived and worked.

When hiring time came, school principals could draw on experienced practitioners whom they knew both personally and professionally and in whose training they had taken an active interest. No computerized choices here. No problems over affirmative action, either.

The participants liked the COP formula. It demanded sacrifice, and it stretched physical and intellectual capacities, but it rewarded honest effort and was almost equally demanding of project staff, university instructors, and others involved in the process.

* * *

It would be both unrealistic and unwise not to acknowledge shortcomings in COP's practice. Here are some from which it is hoped some lessons will be learned.

In their eagerness to accommodate unique COP efforts, some higher education institutions over-relaxed their academic standards. College credit was sometimes given COP paraprofessionals for performing their regular classroom duties without having to analyze or set them in larger frames. Career-related courses were sometimes substituted for requirements that non-COP students had to meet. The sheltered courses offered COP participants were often less challenging than the regular ones. Thus, while strong on technique and the ability to communicate with their students, some participants left the program with incomplete mastery of the subjects they were to teach—to their own detriment and that of the students.

This made COP vulnerable to the charge of anti-intellectualism, an accusation that had bedeviled all of teacher training for much of the 20th century. COP aides, understandably oriented to vocational goals, were hard-pressed to find the time to pursue studies beyond their curriculum demands.

The COP design presupposes high competence on the part of project staff. The expectation was often surpassed, but it sometimes went unmet. Some directors, on whose performance a project's success necessarily hinged, were less than successful in these highly exacting jobs. Criteria for selection should have been uniformly rigorous and the choices more deliberately made. The main shortfall of the inadequate director frequently came down to an inability to move with assurance in university circles.

The community advisory role in COP was apt to fade after the first heady year or two. This tendency, by no means universal, seems to issue from the character of the program itself. Being comprised of community members from the outset, and substantially identical with the community, it anticipates and displaces the council in developing community participation.

For all the program's inherent functional clarity and stability, troubled school systems could and sometimes did succumb to the temptation to use COP's paraprofessionals, without regard to COP goals, as a source of staffing. At one end of the spectrum, a paraprofessional nearing completion of the COP cycle could be eased for the last year or two into a full-time teaching slot, at paraprofessional salary rates. At the other, a COP aide lacking potential as a teacher or instructional aide could maintain COP status with clerical tasks and the minimum number of courses necessary to remain in the project.

* * *

COP reached the end of its 5-year cycle winded but with its strength and dignity intact. Begun as the creation of a loose-knit, always small, coterie of new bureaucrats, most of them gone from the COP scene by the halfway mark, the program came to achieve steady, if unspectacular, respect within the Federal education bureaucracy. There were occasional taps on COP's financial and human resources as "urgent priorities" rose and fell. Adjustments had to be made to shape the COP profile to respond to momentary pressures. At one low point, there was internal USOE talk of fusing COP with other Federal teacher training programs, a move that would have stripped COP of its distinctive qualities. Through it all, the program stayed comfortably afloat in very turbulent seas—a quickly developing teacher surplus, drastic budgetary slashes, far-reaching bureaucratic reorganizations, and the elimination of sibling programs.

As COP winds down, the chronicler finds himself prone to speculate about "what might have been" and "what if." What if COP had been five times or one-fifth as large as it was? How about a State-run COP program cutting across all levels of income? Might the COP that was have taken different turns with different styles of leadership? What if the colleges had staffed and masterminded it? Would important media support and some powerful political backing have created a different COP image? Could COP have been the centerpiece of a national reform of teacher training? And a hundred other challenging "might have beens."

In the last analysis, such speculation is pointless. Not because COP achieved perfection in its actual incarnation, but because the ingredients that went into it were those that were available. They were human, institutional, and political, and COP was no more nor less than their product. The mixture might have been different but probably not by much. By any measure, this Federal program did its job, often with high distinction. Its participants and the society which they served were thereby enriched.

Notes on Sources

(References contain full citations.)

Chapter 1. The Forces Converge

No single source of data dominates this chapter. Background information and impressions on the middle and late 1960s came from general research in, among others, *The Public Interest, Commentary, The Progressive,* and *The New Republic.* On the era of the Great Society and the conditions that led to it, the more productive sources included Michael Harrington, *The Other America*; Robert Coles, *The South Goes North*; Eli Ginzberg and Robert Solow, *The Great Society*; Marvin Gettleman and David Marmelstein, *The Great Society Reader*; Robert Gilmour and Robert Lamb, *Political Alienation in Contemporary America*; and Theodore White, *The Making of the President, 1964.* Of particular value in setting the socio-educational scene were Paul Olson's *Children in a Promised Land* and *A Pride of Lions.* The documents of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, which Olson headed, accurately mirrored growing concern over the circumstances of teacher training, especially in and for low-income settings. These include *Education for 1984 and After, The University Can't Train Teachers,* and *Of Education and the Human Community.*

The accounts of the legislative progress, provisions, and administration of the Elementary and Secondary School Act contained in Stephen Bailey and Edith Mosher, *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law,* and John and Anne Hughes, *Equal Education* (especially on aides in title I programs), were most helpful. The role of the Federal government in teacher training, notably through Teacher Corps, is treated in Ronald Corwin, *Reform and Organizational Survival,* and David Cohen et al., *The Role of Education in Federal Education Training Programs.* Material on COP's "programmatic" antecedents was found in, among others, Alan Gartner, *Paraprofessionals and Their Performance.* On teacher supply, sources used were the Froomkin memoranda, Evelyn Zerfoss and Leo Shapiro, *The Supply and Demand of Teachers and Teaching,* and Don Davies' unpublished article, "The Supply and Demand Tranquilizer." Preliminary drafts of work in progress by the Rand Corporation on this subject were also reviewed.

Heavily used documents were the Davies articles in *American Education, Theory into Practice,* and *Phi Delta Kappan*; William Hart's unpublished "Teacher Training—from NDEA to EPDA"; the Merrow doctoral dissertation; and materials on the passage of the EPDA, particularly the Senate report containing individual and supplemental views. Coverage of the legislative process involved in the passage of the facilitating EPDA legislation was helped by Harry Summerfield's *Power and Process.*

The larger premises of COP outlined in Chapter 1 are supported in varying degrees in a variety of sources like the following: Gartner and Frank Riessman, *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard*; Recruitment LTI, *Community Parity in Federally Funded Programs*; Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor*; and Wilton Anderson's article in *American Education,* "COP's Cause for Celebration." For this chapter, as for most of the others, the *COP Project Directors' Handbook* was the ultimately indispensable source.

Chapter 2. The Paraprofessional: A New Actor in Public Education

A growing but still relatively thin bibliography of significant material on teacher aides furnished most of the background and contextual materials used for this chapter. Articles in the *Journal of Teacher Education,* which devoted almost all of its June 1956 issue to the trailblazing Bay City experiment of 1953, constituted the main source of data on the early years. Such articles as those by John Deason, Mary Shipp, and the Willems provided data on the role of and response to teacher aides in the schools, while Laurel and Daniel Tanner's work gave the views of the profession and the State on the issues of the early years. Alfred Arth and Howard Brighton covered the use of aides in varied settings.

Uniquely important to an understanding of the role of paraprofessionals in education, emphasizing the new low-income paraprofessionals, were: (1) the entire winter 1972 issue of the *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* which included articles on the education paraprofessional in general and COP's in particular; (2) a thorough survey of the field by Beatrice Gudridge for the National School Public Relations Association in 1972; and (3) a comprehensive study of teacher aides in the New York City schools by the Institute for Educational Development.

Two key works by Garda Bowman and Gordon Klopf, *Auxiliary School Personnel* and *New Careers and Roles in the American School,* and one by William Bennett and R. Frank Falk, *New Careers and Urban Schools,* all written in the late sixties, were of special value in covering the early experiments with low-income paraprofessionals which emanated from the OEO-sponsored programs.

Data on paraprofessionals and the human services in general came largely from Gartner's *Paraprofessionals and Their Performance* and from articles in the *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, which devoted its December 1974 issue to the subject. Discussions of the New Careers movement come chiefly from *New Careers for the Poor*, by Pearl and Riessman, and articles in the *Personnel and Guidance Journal* mentioned above.

The analysis of teacher education comes from the large number of analytical and critical works published in the sixties and early seventies, including those by such authors as James Conant, James Koerner, and Charles Silberman, and from journal articles by Arnold Gallegos and Arthur Pearl, among others, on the currency of teacher education programs. Studies by James Stone, Paul Woodring, and Adam Drayer provided further background.

Countless conversations with COP participants, other teacher interns, teachers, teacher educators, and school administrators were instrumental in providing chapter 2 (and other chapters) with both information and their analytical insights.

Chapter 3. The Birth of a Program

Several noteworthy interviews and key documents were especially informative. Some of the more illuminaing conversations took place in late 1974 and early 1975 with Don Davies, William L. Smith, Wilton Anderson, Russell Wood, Donald N. Bigelow, W. Thomas Carter, and J. Ned Bryan, all of whom played key roles in BEPD and/or COP. From outside the Federal system, Frank Riessman, Gordon J. Klopf, Garda W. Bowman, and Alan Gartner contributed valuable data, analysis, and impressions based on long experience. The in-house Russell Wood report, "Administrative Plans for the Education Professions Development Act," and Pearl and Riessman, *New Careers for the Poor*, were put to significant use.

The publications of the COP Leadership Training Institute, notably *IMPACT*, helped illuminate the early days of the program. Equally important was on-the-scene exposure to the work of two COP State coordinators, J. Zeb Wright of West Virginia and C. William Phillips of Ohio. Valuable insights into the functions and approaches of COP project officers during the phase in which Washington controlled the program were provided by Margaret Wiesender and Jorie Mark of USOE.

Additional background material on Federal stewardship came from USOE regional project officers, including Jewell C. Chambers, John Sokol, Isaac Wilder, Richard Naber, Kay Henry, Roberto Olivares, Gerald A. Randall, Esther G. Nichols, Robert M. Mulligan, Hyrum Smith, Robert Workman, and James Roberts. Finally, the discussion was enriched by the comments of the following project directors:

Samuel Bacote, Atlanta, Ga.; John E. Stolz, Spokane, Wash.; John Sullivan, Tempe, Ariz.; Don A. Summers, Hartford, Conn.; Thelma Costen, Omaha, Neb.; Marion Kent, Cincinnati, Ohio; Enrique Barrera, San Antonio, Tex.; and Alice Howard, Richmond, Va.

Chapter 4. The Ingredients of a COP Project

Of the main categories of sources used in this manuscript—interviews and site visits, COP-oriented documents, and background studies—chapter 4 depends more heavily than the other chapters on the first two. The information available on the composition and dynamics of federally funded education projects is largely project-generated and thus highly subjective. The most objective presentation yet made on a COP project was done by Abt Associates in its "Sussex, North Monroe Career Opportunities Program," and this attempt suffers from having been written very early in COP's history. Though it does not reflect how a COP site functioned in its middle and later years, it nevertheless succeeds in getting at the forces that shaped project purposes and operations.

The chapter is basically a distillation and synthesis of the information and insights gained in numerous conversations with COP people of all role groups, in visits to projects around the country, through attendance at regional and State-level COP conferences, and by a close reading of such documents as *A Report on the Career Opportunities Program National Conference*, March 3-6, 1974.

The published source materials used most often were the *COP Project Directors' Handbook* and the publications of the Leadership Training Institute (especially *IMPACT*) and the New Careers Training Laboratory (*COP NOTES* and *COP Bulletins*). Additional sources included 75-100 local project publications and newsletters as well as statistics collected by USOE and/or MIES on appropriations, participants, school systems, and participating colleges and universities.

Chapter 5. The City as COP Turf
and
Chapter 6. In the Country: Large Waves in Small Ponds

The data for these two chapters came chiefly from site visits of 2 to 3 days each to the 10 projects described. These included extensive meetings with COP directors, coordinators, counselors, team leaders, cooperating teachers, administrators, college and university deans and professors, school board members, COP advisory council members, non-COP community and service agency representatives, and, of crucial importance, the participants themselves. All told, the author and

Dr. Margaret Coughlin discussed various facets of COP with approximately 35 project directors, 25 college or university coordinators, 75-100 teachers and staff members of school systems, 100 COP participants, 5 State coordinators (or staff members), all 10 USOE regional project officers, and present and former members of the USOE COP staff. An important feature of all visits was contact with the actual classroom settings in which COP participants worked.

Well in advance of site visits, directors graciously provided project data in considerable detail, and these were thoroughly digested by the visitors prior to discussions at the site. The information included basic statistics, catalogues, curricular materials, participant data, demographic information, and public information materials.

Additional demographic and statistical background data came from Neil Peirce, *The Megastates of America*, Frank Levy et al., *Urban Outcomes*, and David Rogers, *110 Livingston Street*, as well as from census abstracts and articles in travel magazines and journals. These were supplemented by informal previsit conversations with informed non-COP individuals and a close review of the publications of the LTI (especially *IMPACT*) and the New Careers Training Laboratory.

Chapter 7. The Unlikely Alliance: COP and Academe

The statistical data on institutions of higher education on which this chapter is based came primarily from catalogues and bulletins of the colleges and universities covered, as well as from such guides to American colleges and universities as Cass and Birnbaum, Barron's, *The New York Times* guide, and Lovejoy's. The projects provided supplementary information mainly concerned with their own activities in the colleges and universities. Basic materials produced by the U.S. Office of Education, the Civil Rights Commission, the National Education Association, and the New Careers Training Laboratory were also consulted.

Of central importance were discussions, mostly by telephone, with project directors and other key personnel at the nine COP projects described, and conversations with representatives of the 15-20 additional higher education institutions serving COP participants. These were supplemented by raw data on COP interactions with institutions of higher education drawn from a study in progress being conducted by EASE (Evaluation, Audits and Systems in Education) under a contract from the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers at the University of Nebraska.

Information on Rutgers GCOP came chiefly from *COP Bulletin 4* (Vol. II) by John Merrow, and from a meeting with GCOP staff members. Material on the Union Graduate School came from articles by and a conversation with its director, Roy Fairfield, from circulars describing the school's Elementary and Secondary School Administrators' doctoral program, and from the New Careers Training Laboratory's proposal for a doctoral program for COP directors.

More general works that provided necessary background on the place of teacher training institutions included: B. Othanel Smith et al., *Teachers for the Real World*; James C. Stone, *Breakthrough in Teacher Education*; Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom*; and James Conant, *The Education of American Teachers*.

Chapter 8. An Interim Summing Up

This chapter is in most important respects a product of the writer's conversations, observations, and analysis. During the 9 months of research, interviews, and initial drafting that went into the manuscript, he and Dr. Margaret Coughlin engaged in extended discussions with a wide range of persons possessing various levels of expertise on COP and related subjects. Some of the more valuable insights were provided by such individuals as the participants in the August 1974 meeting of the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers.

Documentary sources for chapter 8 were also available. Three of the more prominent were Abt Associates, *Innovation and Change*, the raw data on COP collected by EASE, and the wealth of information collected in NCTL's study of the performance of COP-trained persons in their first year as teachers.

References

Abt Associates. *Innovation and Change: A Study of Strategies in Selected Projects Supported by the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems.* 5 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: 1972.

———. "Sussex, North Monroe Career Opportunities Program," *Innovation and Change,* IIB. Cambridge, Mass.: 1972.

Allen, Dwight W. "A Differentiated Staff: Putting Teacher Talent to Work," *The Teacher and His Staff; Occasional Papers, No. 1.* Washington: National Education Association, National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, 1967.

———, and Gary L. Morrison. "Differentiated Staffing and the Non-Professional: A Need for Educational Personnel Development," *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* V, 2 (Winter 1972), 51-56.

———, *et al. Planning the Development of the Education Professions; A Report to the U.S. Commissioner of Education,* by the Planning Coordination Committee for EPDA. Nov. 15, 1967 (Mimeographed).

American Education, V (Feb. 1969), special section with five articles on EPDA:

Davies, Don, "Education Professions Development."
Chaffee, John, Jr., "First Manpower Assessment."
Olson, Paul A., "T-T-T."
Connors, Joy, "Building a Career Ladder."
Fasteau, I. Jack, "State Grants Program."

Anderson, Robert H. *Teaching in a World of Change.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Anderson, Wilton. "Career Opportunities Program: Process and Evaluation System," *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* V, 2 (Winter 1972), 31-50.

———. "COP's Cause for Celebration," *American Education,* VII (July 1971), 28-33.

———, *et al.* "Career Development: The Lattice, Recruitment, Training and Evaluation," *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* V, 2 (Winter 1972), 3-30.

Andrews, Theodore E., and Wendell C. Allen. "Competency-based Teacher Education," *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* V, 2 (Winter 1972), 69-75.

Arth, Alfred A., *et al. Teacher Aides: The Preparation and Utilization of Paraprofessionals.* Charlottesville, Va.: School of Education, University of Virginia, 1970.

Bailey, Stephen K., and Edith K. Mosher. *ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1968.

Barbour, Floyd B., ed. *The Black Power Revolt.* Boston: F. Porter Sargent Co., 1968.

Bennett, William S., Jr., and R. Frank Falk. *New Careers and Urban Schools: A Sociological Study of Teacher and Teacher Aide Roles.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.

Bigelow, Donald N. *Education, Change and the Office of Education: A Twelve-Year View.* Mar. 1972 (Unpublished paper).

Birnbaum, Martin L., and Chester H. Jones. "Activities of the Social Work Aide," *Social Casework,* XLVIII, 10 (Dec. 1967), 626-32.

Bloom, John H. "The Potential of Teacher Aides in Instruction," *Educational Forum,* XXXVII (Jan. 1973), 195-99.

Borrowman, Merle L., ed. *Teacher Education in America, A Documentary History.* New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

———. "Early Childhood Education: Auxiliary Personnel," *Encyclopedia of Education III* (1971), 158-65.

———. *The Paraprofessional in Follow Through*. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1974.

———. "Team Training in Systematic Observation of Early Childhood Education in the Career Opportunities Program (COP)," *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, V, 2 (Winter 1972), 106-48.

———, and Gordon J. Klopf. *New Careers and Roles in the American School: A Study of Auxiliary Personnel in Education*. New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1968.

Bowman, James, *et al. Of Education and Human Community: A Symposium of Leaders in Experimental Education* (Miami, Sept. 1971). Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska, Curriculum and Development Center, 1972.

Brighton, Howard. *Utilizing Teacher Aides in Differentiated Staffing*. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Co., 1972.

Brummit, Houston, and Anne G. Schieren. "After the Perfect Set Up," *Psychology in the Schools*, XI (Apr. 1974) 229-38.

"The Career Opportunities Program: A Case Study in Evaluation," Ch. VI in David K. Cohen, et al. *The Role of Evaluation in Federal Education Training Programs*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Education Policy Research, Harvard University, 1971.

Career Opportunities Program. *Career Opportunities Program Directory for 1974*. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1974.

———. *Career Opportunities Program Project Directors Handbook*. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

———. *A Report on the Career Opportunities Program National Conference, March 3-6, 1974, Dallas, Texas*. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1974.

Career Opportunities Program, Leadership Training Institute. *Impact*. A monthly newsletter, 1971-1973.

———, Leadership Training Institute. *A Training Manual: Management Information and Evaluation System Design*. Prepared for a COP Conference, Washington, D.C., May 20-21, 1971.

Carroll, Lucille, "The Bay City Experiment . . . As Seen by a Classroom Teacher," *Journal of Teacher Education*, VII (June 1956), 142-53.

Carter, W. Thomas. "The Career Opportunities Program: A Summing Up," COP Bulletin 8, Vol. III, 1975-76.

Cohen, David, *et al. The Role of Evaluation in Federal Education Training Programs*. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Education Policy Research, Harvard University, 1971.

Coleman, James S., ed. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. 2 Vols. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Coles, Robert. *The South Goes North*, Vol. III of Children of Crisis. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1967.

Conant, James. *The Education of American Teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

"COP: A National View," *American Education*, VII (July 1971), 34-35.

COP Bulletin. A series of papers and articles published monthly on topics related to the Career Opportunities Program. From late 1973. New Careers Training Laboratory, Queens College, New York.

COP Notes. An eight-page monthly newsletter on the activities of the various projects of the Career Opportunities Program. Sept. 1973-June 1975. New Careers Training Laboratory, Queens College, New York.

Corwin, Ronald G. *Reform and Organizational Survival: The Teacher Corps as an Instrument of Educational Change*. New York: John Wiley, 1973.

Davies, Don. "Come Out from Under the Ivy," *American Education*, VI (Mar. 1970).

———. "Reflections on EPDA," *Theory in Practice*, XIII (June 1974), 210-17.

———. *The Supply and Demand Tranquilizer*. 1972 (Draft article).

Deason, John. "What They Say about Teacher-Aides," *The School Executive*, LVII (Dec. 1957), 59–60.

Decade of Experiment: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1951–61. New York: Ford Foundation, 1961.

DeSilva, Benjamin, and Richard D. Lucas. *Practical School Volunteer and Teacher-Aide Programs.* West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., 1974.

Drayer, Adam M. *The Teacher in a Democratic Society, An Introduction to the Field of Education.* Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

EASE (Evaluation, Audits and Systems in Education). Raw data on COP directors, COP-State relations, and COP-IHE interactions prepared for the Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers. Lincoln, Nebr.: 1972.

Emerling, Frank C., and Kanawha Z. Chavis. "The Teacher Aide," *Educational Leadership*, XXIV (Nov. 1966), 175–83.

"EPDA from the Top: An Interview with Don Davies," *Phi Delta Kappan*, L (Sept. 1968).

Fairfield, Roy P. "Who/What Resides in Residency?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, LVI (Feb. 1975), 409–11.

Feagin, Joe R., ed. *The Urban Scene: Myths and Realities.* New York: Random House, 1973.

Foster, Betty J. *Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools, Fall 1973.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1974.

Froomkin, Joseph, Assistant Commissioner for Program Planning and Evaluation (USOE). Memorandum to Education Professions Task Force *re* Education Professions Development Act Planning, Sept. 28, 1967.

———. Memorandum to Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, *re* Education Professions Development Act, Dec. 5, 1967.

Gallegos, Arnold M. "Teacher Training: The Realities," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XXIII, 1 (Spring 1972), 43–46.

Gartner, Alan. *Do Paraprofessionals Improve Human Services: A First Critical Appraisal of the Data.* New York: New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1969.

———. *Paraprofessionals and their Performance: A Survey of Education, Health, and Social Service Programs.* New York: Praeger, 1971.

———, and Frank Riessman. "The Paraprofessional Movement in Perspective," *The Personnel and Guidance Journal*, LIII (Dec. 1974), 253–56.

———, and Frank Riessman. *The Service Society and the Consumer Vanguard.* New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

———, and Harriet Johnson. *An Examination of College Programs for Paraprofessionals.* New York: New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1970.

———, Mary Conway Kohler, and Frank Riessman. *Children Teach Children: Learning Through Teaching.* New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Gettleman, Marvin E., and David Mermelstein, eds. *The Great Society Reader: The Failure of American Liberalism.* New York: Random House, 1967.

Gilmour, Robert S., and Robert B. Lamb. *Political Alienation in Contemporary America.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975.

Ginzberg, Eli, and Robert M. Solow, eds. *The Great Society: Lessons for the Future.* New York: Basic Books, 1974.

Greenberg, Barry. *Review of Literature Relating to the Use of Non-Professionals in Education (From 1942–1967).* New York: New Careers Development Center, New York University, 1967.

Grosser, Charles, *et al.*, eds. *Non-Professionals in the Human Services.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Gudridge, Beatrice M. *Paraprofessionals in Schools, How New Careerists Bolster Education.* Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association, 1972.

Harrington, Michael. *The Other America, Poverty in the United States.* New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Hart, William. *Teacher Training—From NDEA to EPDA.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1968 (Mimeographed).

Hodenfeld, G. K., and T. M. Sinnett. *The Education of Teachers: Conflict and Consensus.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1961.

"How the Profession Feels About Teacher Aides," *National Education Association Journal,* LVI (Nov. 1967), 16-17.

Howe, Harold, II. *The People who Serve Education: A Report on the State of the Education Professions by the United States Commissioner of Education.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1968.

Hughes, John F., and Anne O. Hughes. *Equal Education, A New National Strategy.* Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1972.

Human Factors Research Laboratory. *The Evaluation of Leadership Training Institutes.* Fort Collins, Colo.: Colorado State University, 1971.

Institute for Education Development (IED). *An In-Depth Study of Paraprofessionals in District Decentralized ESEA Title I and New York State Urban Education Projects in the New York City Schools.* A Study for the Board of Education of the City of New York: 1970 (Summary).

Intergovernmental Conference on Teacher Policies, Paris, November 26-29, 1974. *Report of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.* Washington: U S. Office of Education, 1974.

Jencks, Christopher, *et al. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Johnson, Larry, and R. W. Faunce. "Teacher Aides," *The Elementary School Journal,* LXXIV (Dec. 1973), 136-44.

Kaplan, George R. *Bibliography on EPDA: BEPD/NCIES/OCE and Program Activity under EPDA Authority.* Washington: 1974 (Mimeographed).

Klopf, Gordon J., Garda Bowman, and Adena Joy. *A Learning Team: Teacher and Auxiliary.* New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1969.

Koerner, James D. *The Miseducation of American Teachers.* Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963.

Landsmann, Leanna. "Interview with Albert Shanker," *Instructor,* LXXXII (Nov. 1973), 40-42.

Levy, Frank S., Arnold Meltsner, and Aaron Wildavsky. *Urban Outcomes.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

Mark, Jorie L. *Training and Utilization of Paraprofessionals: A Study of the Nation's Public School Systems Enrolling 5,000 or more pupils.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1975.

Merrow, John. *The Use and Abuse of Discretionary Authority in the United States Office of Education.* Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1973.

Mood, Alexander, *et al. Do Teachers Make a Difference? A Report on Recent Research on Pupil Achievement.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1970.

Mosteller, Frederick, and Daniel P. Moynihan. *On Equality of Educational Opportunity.* New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

National Conference on the Paraprofessional, Career Advancement, and Pupil Learning, Jan. 9-10, 1969. *Descriptions of Paraprofessional Programs in Education.* Washington: 1969 (Mimeographed).

National Education Association. [membership pamphlet], Washington, D.C., 1974.

National Education Association Handbook, 1973-74. Washington: 1974.

New Careers Training Laboratory (NCTL). *Paraprofessionals and the School.* New York: Queens College, n.d.

———. *A Project to Design and Develop a Doctoral Program Appropriate for COP Directors.* NCTL grant proposal to U.S. Office of Education. New York: Queens College, 1974.

———. *The Utilization and Training of Paraprofessionals in Special Education: Present Status and Future Prospects.* New York: Queens College, 1974.

Olson, Paul A., ed. *Children in a Promised Land.* The U.S. Office of Education Tri-University Project in Elementary Education, Third National Conference, Salt Lake City, May 23-25, 1968, n.p.

———, ed. *A Pride of Lions.* The U.S. Office of Education Tri-University Project in Elementary Education. Washington: 1968.

———, *et al.*, eds. *Education for 1984 and After.* A symposium of deans of education and leaders in institutions educating teachers, Schiller Park, Ill., July 1971. Lincoln, Nebr.: Curriculum Development Center, University of Nebraska, 1972.

———, *et al.*, eds. *The University Can't Train Teachers.* (Proceedings of a symposium in Denver, July 24-25, 1971.) Lincoln, Nebr.: Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers, University of Nebraska, 1972.

"Paraprofessionals and Reading," *The Reading Teacher,* XXVII, Supp. 1-8 (Dec. 1973), 2-3.

"Paraprofessionals, Partners or Rivals?" *Instructor,* LXXXII (Nov. 1973), 43-45.

"Paraprofessionals Plus Career Opportunities Equal Quality Education for Children," Special Issue of the *Journal of Research and Development in Education.* V, 2 (Winter, 1972).

"Paras, Peers, and Pros." Special Issue of *The Personnel and Guidance Journal.* LIII, 4 (Dec. 1974).

Pearl, Arthur. *The Atrocity of Education.* New York: E. P. Dutton, 1972.

———. "The Paraprofessional in Education: An Analysis and a Perspective." In forthcoming book on paraprofessionals. New York: New Careers Training Laboratory, Queens College, New York, 1975.

———. "Paraprofessionals and Social Change," *The Personnel and Guidance Journal,* LIII (Dec. 1974), 264-68.

———, and Frank Riessman. *New Careers for the Poor: The Non-Professional in Human Service.* New York: Free Press, 1965.

Peirce, Neal R. *The Megastates of America.* New York: Norton, 1972.

Recruitment Leadership Training Institute. *Community Parity in Federally Funded Programs.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1972.

———. *Teacher Shortage or Surplus: That is the Question.* Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1972.

Resource Management Corporation. *Full-Scale Implementation of a Process Evaluation System for Programs of the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems.* Six volumes. Bethesda, Md.: 1972.

Riessman, Frank. "Can Schools Teach Children: What is Stopping Them—What is to be Done?" *Journal of Research and Development in Education,* V, 2 (Winter, 1972), 83-90.

———, and Hermine I. Popper, eds. *Up From Poverty: New Career Ladders for Non-Professionals.* New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Rogers, David, *110 Livingston Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York City School System.* New York: Random House, 1968.

Sarason, Seymour B. *The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

———. *The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Schmieder, Allen. *Reformese Jargon: The Language and Literature of Educational Reform.* Washington: USOE/NCIES and ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1973.

Shipp, Mary D. "Teacher Aides: A Survey," *The National Elementary Principal,* XLVI, 6 (May 1967), 30-33.

Silberman, Charles E. *Crisis in the Classroom, The Remaking of American Education.* New York: Random House, 1971.

Singer, Ira J. "Survey of Staff Utilization Practices in Six States," *National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin,* XLVI, 270 (Jan. 1962), 1-11.

Smith, B. Othanel, *et al. Teachers for the Real World.* Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1969.

Spiegel, Hans B. C., ed. *Citizen Participation in Urban Development.* Fairfax, Va.: Learning Resources Corporation/National Training Laboratories, 1974. Vol. III: *Decentralization.*

Stone, James C. *Breakthrough in Teacher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education and the Education of Teachers (SCUEET). *August Document.* Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska, 1972.

Summerfield, Harry L., *et al. Power and Process. The Formulation and Limits of Federal Educational Policy.* Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Sweet, Alan. "A Decade of Paraprofessional Programs in Minneapolis Public Schools." *COP Bulletin,* II, 6.

"A Symposium: The Bay City, Michigan, Experiment, A Cooperative Study for the Better Utilization of Teacher Competencies," *Journal of Teacher Education,* VII (June 1956), 101-152.

Tanner, Laurel N., and Daniel Tanner. "The Teacher Aide: A National Study of Confusion," *Educational Leadership,* XXVI (May 1969), 765-69.

"Teacher Aide Trial Successful, Declares Bay City School Official," *School Executive,* LXXVI (Feb. 1957), 106.

Templeton, Ian. "Paraprofessionals," *ERIC Educational Management Review Series,* No. 11 (Nov. 1972), 1-9.

Tesconi, Charles A., Jr., and Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr. *Education for Whom? The Question of Equal Educational Opportunity.* New York: Dodd, Mead, 1974.

The Union Graduate School. *Program for Innovation in Elementary and Secondary Education.* Yellow Springs, Ohio: Union Graduate School, 1975.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. *Mexican American Education Study.* Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

U.S. Congress. Public Law 90-35, *Education Professions Development Act.* June, 1967. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967. (Reprinted by DHEW/USOE/BEPD.)

U.S. Congress. Senate. *Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965.* Report, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., including individual and supplemental views submitted by Senator Morse to accompany S. 2028, June, 1967. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Congress. Senate. *Education Amendments of 1972.* Conference Report, 92nd Cong., 2nd Sess., submitted by Senator Pell to accompany S. 659. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Office of Civil Rights. *Directory of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Selected Districts, Fall, 1972.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

U.S. Office of Education. *Digest of Educational Statistics, 1973.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1974.

———. *The Education Professions, 1969-1970: An Annual Report on the People Who Serve Our Schools and Colleges by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1970.

———. *The Education Professions, 1971-1972.* Four parts. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973.

———, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. *BEPD: Organization, Mission and Functions.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969.

———, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development. *Facts about Programs for 1970-71, EPDA, Parts C, D, and F.* Washington: Government Printing Office, n.d.

———, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Task Force on Technical Assistance. *A Means to a Mission.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1972.

———, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Development. *Developments.* A newsletter issued periodically from mid-late 1971 to early 1973. For several months, issuing office called Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Renewal.

———, National Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems. *EPDA Program Manual: Career Opportunities Program, Urban/Rural School Development Program, Vocational Education (State Cooperative Arrangements)* Section 553. Washington: 1972 (Draft).

———. *NCIES—Information and Ideas.* A mimeographed house organ issued biweekly until Sept. 1972.

Vogel, Anita. *Establishing a New Career: The Social Health Technician.* New York: Mobilization for Youth, 1970.

Warren, Stanley. "How I See Black America," *Educational Leadership*, XXXII, 6 (Mar. 1975), 417-19.

White, Theodore H. *The Making of the President, 1964.* New York: Atheneum, 1965.

Willems, Arnold L., and Kenneth D. Willems. "What should be the Role of Elementary School Classroom Aides?" *Education*, XCIV (Nov. 1973), 122-26.

Wood, Russell, *et al. Administrative Plans for the Education Professions Development Act*, Dec. 1967 (Mimeographed).

Woodring, Paul, and John Scanlon, eds. *American Education Today.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Zerfoss, Evelyn, and Leo J. Shapiro. *The Supply and Demand of Teachers and Teaching.* Lincoln, Nebr.: University of Nebraska, 1973.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1977 O-215-113